

EXAMINING THE NATURE OF INTERACTIONS WHICH FACILITATE
LEARNING AND IMPACT READING ACHIEVEMENT DURING
A READING APPRENTICESHIP: A CASE STUDY OF
AT-RISK ADOLESCENT READERS

Mary L. Arthur, B.S., M.Ed.

Dissertation Prepared for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS

December 1999

APPROVED:

Diane D. Allen, Major Professor
Terry L. Holcomb, Minor Professor
Cynthia H. Brock, Committee Member
John C. Stansell, Chair of the Department of
Teacher Education & Administration
M. Jean Keller, Dean of the College of
Education
C. Neal Tate, Dean of the Robert B. Toulouse
School of Graduate Studies

Arthur, Mary L., Examining the nature of interactions which facilitate learning and impact reading achievement during a reading apprenticeship: A case study of at-risk adolescent readers. Doctor of Education (Reading), December 1999, 230 pp., 2 tables, references, 77 titles.

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to explore the interactions that take place during a reading apprenticeship which facilitate the learning of reading strategies by adolescent students who are at the middle school level and are still at-risk for reading failure and to investigate how a reading apprenticeship affects reading achievement in the areas of fluency, vocabulary development, comprehension, and the self-perception of the reader.

The case study was descriptive and interpretive in nature, and examined two students, each of whom was part of a one-to-one reading apprenticeship. The researcher served as participant observer in both cases and was the teacher in each of the one-to-one reading apprenticeships. The primary data set was qualitative in nature, and elements of quantitative data were also considered.

Sessions included pretesting and posttesting using the Classroom Assessment of Reading Processes (Swearingen & Allen, 1997), reading from narrative or expository books, working with words, writing, and dialoguing about the reading. Reading strategies were directly taught, modeled, and reinforced by the teacher/researcher with the goal of the students internalizing the strategies and improving their reading in the

areas of fluency, vocabulary development, and comprehension, as well as improving their attitudes toward reading and their self-perception about their reading ability.

This study described a reading apprenticeship which positively impacted reading achievement for two students in the areas of fluency, comprehension, and vocabulary development, as well as influencing their motivation for reading and their self-perceptions as readers. The environment of the reading apprenticeship, the dialogue that occurred throughout the reading apprenticeship, and strategy instruction, modeling, and reinforcement were found to be factors and interactions which facilitated learning during this intervention.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	v
CHAPTER 1	1
INTRODUCTION.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	1
Significance of the Study	3
Research Questions.....	5
Definition of Terms	5
Limitations	8
Assumptions	8
CHAPTER 2	9
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	9
Theoretical Framework.....	10
Persistence of Reading Failure	14
Students' Educational Histories	15
Students' Lack of Use of Effective Reading Strategies.....	18
Students' Attitudes and Stress Related to Reading	21
The Individual Needs of Students.....	23
The Mismatch with School Culture	25
Summary	26
Reading as a Transactive Process.....	26
Tutoring as an Effective Intervention Model	30
Reading Apprenticeship.....	36
Reading Strategies	40
Decoding Strategies	40
Comprehension Strategies	42
Vocabulary-Building Strategies.....	44
Test-Taking Strategies	46
Summary	48
Research Questions.....	49
CHAPTER 3	51
METHODOLOGY	51
Introduction	51
Research Design	51
Subjects	52
Setting	56
Instrumentation.....	58

<i>Classroom Assessment of Reading Processes (CARP)</i>	58
State Test Scores	59
Student Interviews and Questionnaires	60
Parent Questionnaires.....	60
Teacher Questionnaires	60
Videotapes	61
Running Records.....	61
Reflective Journals.....	62
Description of Cases	62
Case One, Ben	62
Case Two, Juanita	94
Data Analysis	137
CHAPTER 4	139
RESEARCH RESULTS AND FINDINGS.....	139
Purpose of the Study	139
Research Questions.....	139
Results.....	140
Results of Question 1	140
Results of Question 2	145
Results of Question 3	152
Results of Question 4	156
Results of Question 5	166
Results of Question 6	176
Summary of Results	179
CHAPTER 5	185
CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	185
Introduction	185
Results.....	187
Conclusions and Implications	191
Environment	192
Dialogue	195
Strategy Instruction.....	198
Summary of Implications	200
Recommendations for Further Study.....	202
APPENDIX A.....	205
PERMISSIONS FOR CONDUCTING RESEARCH.....	206
APPENDIX B.....	212
STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRES	213
APPENDIX C.....	217

PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE.....	218
APPENDIX D.....	219
TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE	220
APPENDIX E.....	222
SAMPLES OF RUNNING RECORDS	223
REFERENCES	225

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1

Running Record Analysis..... 141

Table 2

State Test Results..... 148

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

The idea that one could fall behind academically at six or seven years old and never catch up seems impossible, but that is exactly what happens to many of our students whom we label "at-risk". They experience confusion, frustration, and anxiety over something that is fairly easy for most children: learning to read. Scholars (Allington, 1983; Campbell & Howard, 1993; Pinnell, 1989; Smith, 1994) suggest that in a few short but critical months, educational life passes these at-risk students by, and they begin a pattern of thinking that tells them they can't do things in school very well. This pattern may last for years or the rest of their lives.

What happens to these students during the next twelve years of their educational life is even more frustrating, not only to the students and their parents, but to all of those educators trying to help them (Kos, 1991). Most of these students are placed in special programs designed to remediate their reading difficulties; however, they continue to struggle along at each grade level. In the middle and secondary schools, where most students are past the early developmental reading stages of decoding for pronunciation and developing fluency, the concepts of deeper comprehension of ideas, themes, and application to real life, author's styles and use of literary devices, and reading informational text to gain knowledge become the teacher's concern. What happens, then, to the students who fall behind in reading skills early in their school life and never

get caught up? They become the Remedial Reading class, as well as failures or at-risk students in many of their other core subject classes. Research on remedial programs suggests that remediation of learning problems after the primary grades has been largely ineffective (e.g. Allington, 1994; Campbell & Howard, 1993; Kennedy, Birman, & Demaline, 1986), yet we continue to do the same thing for remedial students year after year. Research has shown that this persistence of reading failure in adolescents is not simply due to problems within the student, but that the educational system itself has contributed to their lack of progress (Allington, 1983; Alm, 1981; Campbell and Howard, 1993; Kos, 1991; Lave, 1996; Oakes, 1985; Rose, 1989; Smith, 1994).

Recently, there has been a great deal of research on emergent literacy, and interventions with below level first graders have been highly successful (e.g. Clay, 1993; Pinnell, 1989; Reynolds, 1993; Wasik & Slavin, 1993). Ideally, we should "catch" all of the students who experience reading problems in those early years with interventions, thus preventing any students from being at-risk for reading failure in upper grades. Realistically however, we will always have children who for some reason did not receive that intervention.

Norman Unrau, editor of *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy* (1998), purports, "While not questioning the paramount importance of early literacy development, we hear much less about a parallel crisis in adolescent literacy development- the magnitude of which is yet to be fully measured, let alone confronted and addressed" (p. 604). Vacca (1998) warns the reading community to not marginalize adolescent literacy at a time when the literacy development of early adolescents and

teenagers is more critical than ever. He urges us to "beware of putting all of our eggs in the basket of improved literacy in early childhood" (p. 609). We have a serious problem with our struggling at-risk adolescents, and we need to search for solutions.

The problem investigated in this study deals with how the interactions between a tutor and adolescent students in a reading apprenticeship facilitate learning of reading strategies and affect reading achievement.

Six areas are addressed in the review of literature which build the background and rationale for the study: the theoretical framework (Gee, 1996; Goodman, 1994; Lave, 1996; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Paris, Lipson, & Wixson, 1994; Phillips & Soltis, 1998; Rogoff, 1990; Rosenblatt, 1978, 1994; Wertsch, 1985, 1991, Wong, Groth, & O'Flahavan, 1994), the persistence of reading failure (Allington, 1983; Alm, 1981; Gee, 1996; Kos, 1991; Oakes, 1985; Rose, 1989; Smith, 1994), reading as a transactive process (Goodman, 1994; Rosenblatt, 1978; Ruddell & Unrau, 1994; Smith, 1994), tutoring as an effective intervention model (Anderson, 1994; Clay, 1993; Gaustad, 1992; Juel, 1996; Madden, Slavin, Wasik, & Dolan, 1997; Vygotsky, 1978; Wasik & Slavin, 1993), apprenticeship (Dorn, French & Jones, 1998; Knapp & Winsor, 1998; Lave, 1996; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Rogoff, 1990), and effective reading strategies (Bereiter & Bird, 1985; Clay, 1993; Crawley & Marritt, 1996; Dorn, French & Jones, 1998; Palincsar, 1986; Rosenshine & Meister, 1997).

Significance of the Study

The broad focus of this dissertation study is the interaction that takes place during a reading apprenticeship which facilitates the learning of reading strategies by

adolescent students who are at the middle school level and are still at-risk for reading failure. There has been a great deal of research on emergent literacy, and interventions such as Reading Recovery, Success for All, and Reading Apprenticeship have been highly successful with below level elementary students (Clay, 1993; Knapp & Winsor, 1998; Madden, Slavin, Wasik, & Dolan, 1997; Pinnell, 1989; Reynolds, 1993; Wasik & Slavin, 1993). Current research on effective reading instruction for adolescents who are at-risk is minimal. This qualitative study was designed to develop a reading apprenticeship with adolescent students and to investigate the interactions common to the intervention models used with younger students in an environment with adolescents.

This study contributes to the knowledge base of adolescent literacy. According to Vacca (1998),

The literacy development of a 12-year old in a middle school or a 17-year-old in high school remains as critical a concern to society as the literacy development of a preschool child or a child in the elementary grades. Unless we take seriously the role that literacy plays in adolescents' lives, not much will change in the way we plan and enact curriculum that will support and extend their literacy development. (p. 609).

The study also contributes to the knowledge base regarding reading interventions for below level, at-risk readers. Wasik & Slavin (1993) purport from their study of one-to-one tutoring, that it is an effective means of preventing student reading failure and deserves an important place in further study of how it works. "It would be important to begin to understand how the interaction between the tutor and the student

results in learning to read" (p. 198). Pinnell (1989) suggests that "research is needed to discover more about how at-risk children learn to read and write in a highly supportive context" (p. 180). This study seeks to explore the nature of the interactions that occur between the tutor and the student and to investigate how those interactions can facilitate the learning during a reading apprenticeship.

Research Questions

This qualitative study is designed as a case study. I seek to answer the following questions regarding the facilitation of learning by adolescent students in the environment of a reading apprenticeship:

- 1) How will a reading apprenticeship impact reading achievement in the area of fluency?
- 2) How will a reading apprenticeship impact reading achievement in the area of comprehension?
- 3) How will a reading apprenticeship impact reading achievement in the area of vocabulary development?
- 4) How will a reading apprenticeship impact the self-perception of the reader?
- 5) What reading strategies were directly or indirectly taught or modeled during the reading apprenticeship?
- 6) What are the nature of the interactions that seem to be the most important in facilitating the learning during a reading apprenticeship?

Definition of Terms

Adolescent learner: A student between the ages of eleven and fourteen who is in

middle school grade six, seven, or eight.

Aesthetic stance: The kind of reading where the reader adopts an attitude of readiness to focus attention on what is being lived through during the reading event (Rosenblatt, 1994).

At-risk student: A student who, for various reasons, is not successful at school and who is considered by teachers and administrators a potential drop-out.

Efferent stance: The kind of reading in which attention is centered predominantly on what is to be extracted and retained after the reading event (Rosenblatt, 1994).

Expository text: "Text that provides information to the reader; it may be organized in a variety of structures" (Swearingen & Allen, 1997).

Fluency: Reading which demonstrates appropriate rate, accuracy of word identification, text phrasing or chunking, and prosodic features (Strecker, 1999).

Frustration reading level: "The level at which a reader experiences extreme difficulty with decoding and/or comprehension" (Swearingen & Allen, 1997).

Independent reading level: "The level at which a reader can easily read materials without help from the teacher; little or no problems with decoding or comprehension" (Swearingen & Allen, 1997).

Instructional reading level: "The level at which a reader benefits from instruction regarding decoding and comprehension strategies; decoding and comprehension are still high" (Swearingen & Allen, 1997).

Literacy: The ability to use reading and writing in authentic tasks which are

meaningful for communication, gaining knowledge, and interacting with others in a society.

Miscue: "Oral word errors that occur when a reader deviates from the printed text; examples include mispronunciations, substitutions, omissions, repetitions, and teacher-provided words" (Swearingen & Allen, 1997).

Narrative text: "Text that is organized around a story structure that includes characters, setting, plot episodes, and resolution of problem" (Swearingen & Allen, 1997).

Protocol: "Worksheet on which the examiner marks responses given by the student, indicates performance levels, and/or writes notations regarding student responses and reading behaviors" (Swearingen & Allen, 1997).

Reading apprenticeship: A reading arrangement in which a more experienced reader reads books together with a below level reader, helping with decoding of difficult words, suggesting explanations of confusing passages, and in other ways scaffolding the reading experience so that the below level reader is able to accomplish the reading of a personally chosen book which would have been beyond his or her independent capabilities (Knapp, 1998)

Scaffolding: "Temporary ... support systems which help the child to function effectively and can lead to the child taking over independent action before long" (Clay, 1991, p. 62).

Schemata: a reader's fund of related experiences of background knowledge which are continually and actively revised (Bartlett, 1932, as cited by Rosenblatt, 1994;

Tierney & Pearson, 1994).

Zone of proximal development: "the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers " (Vygotsky,1978, p.86).

Limitations

This study was designed as a two-case study. Therefore, the findings cannot be generalized to any other situation except through reader generalizability (Merriam, 1988). The extent to which this study can be utilized in other settings by other educators is left to the people in those situations. The researcher has attempted to enhance the usefulness of the work for others by providing a rich, thick description and by conducting a cross-case analysis as described in Merriam (1988, p. 177).

Assumptions

Assumptions upon which this research was based include the following:

- 1) An apprenticeship between a tutor and an adolescent student will include the building of a trust relationship in which the student will feel at ease and will be willing to take risks in learning.
- 2) A reading apprenticeship will positively impact reading achievement in the areas of fluency, comprehension, vocabulary development, and reader self-perception.
- 3) A reading apprenticeship will result in interactions which will facilitate student learning.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The broad focus of this dissertation study is the interaction that takes place during a reading apprenticeship that facilitates the learning of reading strategies by adolescent students who are at the middle school level and are at-risk for reading failure. This chapter provides background information relevant to the problem studied. Six areas are addressed which are included to build the background and rationale for the study. The first section is an overview of the theoretical framework which undergirds the study and establishes the philosophical orientation of the researcher.

Second is a review of literature concerning the persistence of reading failure which explore some of the causes for middle school students remaining at-risk in reading even after receiving remedial assistance for many years. Within this section, five causes are discussed: students' educational histories, students' lack of use of effective reading strategies, students' attitudes and stress related to reading, the individual needs of students, and the mismatch of students with school culture.

Next is a discussion of reading as a transactive process, which suggests alternative teaching practices to the ineffective instruction indicated in the second section. Then, studies involving tutoring as an effective intervention model are reviewed because the dissertation study was done in a one-to-one setting. The fifth section narrows the tutoring model to discuss specifically the reading apprenticeship model of tutoring which is the model used for this study. Finally, a review of the

literature regarding reading strategies that have been shown to be successful for below level readers is included to document sources for the researcher's decisions concerning choices of reading strategies to model and teach during the reading apprenticeship. To conclude this chapter, the research questions are restated.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework for this dissertation study is drawn from three major theories of learning: cognitive theory, constructivist theory, and sociocultural theory. To construct a personal theory of learning to undergird this study, key aspects of these major theories come together to form a balance of ideas and methods that make up an environment conducive to learning.

Cognitive theorists, such as Piaget, believed that as children develop, the operations and other concepts being formed are interrelated or organized, and thus they form a network, or a cognitive structure (Phillips and Soltis, 1998). Piaget's concepts relate to reading in understanding how meaning is constructed. As readers engage with text, they assimilate information provided that it fits within their existing schemata and accommodate existing schemata to new knowledge. The ability of a reader to comprehend a given text on his/her own is limited by the conceptual and experiential background of the reader (Goodman, 1994). Part of the schemata of a reader is the declarative (knowing that a strategy can be used), procedural (knowing how to use a strategy), and conditional (knowing when and why to use a strategy), knowledge of the reading process and reading strategies (Paris, Lipson, & Wixson, 1994).

Constructivist theorists, such as von Glasersfeld, argue that the individual learner is not the recipient of knowledge that is transferred from another source, but rather is involved in actively constructing his or her own knowledge (Phillips and Soltis, 1998). John Dewey first coined the term "transaction" as he described learning as a person's transaction with the world around him (Rosenblatt, 1994). Rosenblatt (1978) theorized that a reader constructs knowledge as he or she experiences a transaction with text, be it written or oral language. In this theory, meaning resides in the transaction, not in the text itself.

Theorists who have contributed to sociocultural theory believe that what is missing from earlier learning theories is the recognition that learners always belong to social groups (Phillips and Soltis, 1998). Vygotsky's (1978) work focused on the social aspect of constructivism. He believed that only through social interaction does the construction of knowledge take place (Wertsch, 1985). Additionally important are Bakhtin's beliefs concerning ways that language serves as a means for mediating human understanding (Wertsch, 1991).

Sociocultural theory indicates that learning happens only in a social context and that language is the psychological tool that mediates that learning. Vygotsky felt that developmental stages and IQ were only static indicators of what intellectual tasks a child could accomplish on his or her own. He was more interested in the learning potential that a child might have and what might be accomplished with the guidance of adults or older peers (Phillips and Soltis, 1998). Crucial to sociocultural theory is Vygotsky's notion of the zone of proximal development, which is "the distance between

the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving in collaboration with more a more knowledgeable other " (1978, p.86). According to Wong, Groth, and O'Flahavan (1994), Vygotsky's view of intelligence as being shaped by social as opposed to innate forces is helpful in teaching students who may be marginalized by the dominate culture because of their racial or economic background or because they have been labeled as having learning problems. Learning is facilitated through the assistance of more knowledgeable members of the community and culture who can mediate understanding through language.

The central notion in Bakhtin's work is his concept about semiotic mediation referred to as "dialogicality". Dialogicality refers to "the ways in which one speaker's concrete utterances come into contact with the utterances of another" (Wertsch, 1991, p. 54). Bakhtin's belief that true understanding is dialogic in nature is important to the concept of the more knowledgeable other mediating the understanding of the at-risk child. Educators cannot simply transfer knowledge and understanding to students. For true understanding to take place, a teacher must work within a child's zone of proximal development which allows the child to bridge from the known to the new by interacting with a supportive adult.

Gee (1996) suggests that literacy is deeply related to social practices and cannot be separated from them. Literacy practices involve "ways of talking, interacting, thinking, valuing, and believing" (p.41). Literacy is the ability to use reading and writing in authentic tasks which are meaningful for communication, gaining knowledge,

and interacting with others in a society. Students who have persisted in reading failure have failed not only to read and comprehend text on their grade level, but have failed to understand the ways of the mainstream school community to use literacy to communicate, gain knowledge, and interact with others in society.

Lave & Wenger (1991) refer to the notion of situated cognition or situated learning. "What students come to learn, and how they learn it, cannot be understood solely in terms of what cognitive processes are occurring inside their individual heads - learning occurs effectively, and naturally, in 'situations' in which the student is located and actively engaged" (Phillips and Soltis, 1998).

Gee (1996) explains that literacy practices take place in a sociocultural environment, where who we are and what we do is evidenced by our social languages, or the culture of which we are a member. We can be members of multiple cultures (such as ethnic culture, home and family culture, school culture, church culture). We use different languages and ways of doing things in these cultures that Gee calls our "identity kit". For students who do not see themselves as fitting into the school culture, this identity kit may not include ways of thinking and doing that take place in schools. To be successful, these students must adjust their identity kits to belong. Teachers can help this process by acknowledging the identity kits of students where they are, and apprenticing them into the community of practice of the school.

The notion of apprenticeship has been related to educational practice by Lave & Wenger (1991) and Rogoff (1990). Lave (1996) argues that "learning is a facet of the communities of practice of which they are composed" (p. 150). She further asserts that

the informal practices through which learning occurs in apprenticeship are "powerful and robust" (p. 150). Interpersonal relationships in the form of apprenticeships allow activity beyond one's independent level of functioning which builds competence (Rogoff, 1990). The apprenticeship model allows for the dyadic relationship through which learning can take place within the child's zone of proximal development.

This section has been a review of the theoretical framework from which this study is drawn to clarify the researcher's theoretical orientation (Merriam, 1988). The next section serves to build the background and rationale for the study and begins with a description of reasons for the persistence of reading failure among adolescents.

Persistence of Reading Failure

Several researchers in the field of reading have suggested factors that may have prevented students from progressing in their reading development (Allington, 1983; Alm, 1981; Campbell and Howard, 1993; Gee, 1996; Kos, 1991; Oakes, 1985; Rose, 1989; Smith, 1994). During the review of this research, several common factors that relate to the educational system itself have surfaced that could be contributing to the persistence of reading failure in the adolescent student: 1) aspects of students' educational histories, such as placement, testing, and type of reading instruction received, 2) students' lack of effective use of reading strategies, 3) students' attitude and stress related to reading, 4) the individual needs of students, and 5) the sociocultural aspects of a mismatch students have with the school culture to which they attempt to belong. This section is divided into five parts - each a discussion of one of the above factors in the persistence of reading failure.

Students' Educational Histories

Although the educational history of each student differs, there seem to be commonalities running through the school experiences of students who are still reading significantly below grade level by the time they are in middle school. Kos (1991) did a case study on four middle school students who were reading disabled. In looking back into their educational records, she found that all four students were identified as having reading difficulties in kindergarten or first grade. After psychoeducational testing, three of the four were placed in special LD classrooms where they remained throughout their school careers. According to school records, none of the students made significant improvement despite 7 to 9 years of instruction.

The learning disabilities program placed its primary emphasis on a skills approach to reading instruction. Kos learned that the students' current teachers in the LD classrooms were more concerned with the behavior problems of the students than their reading problems, and the students were receiving no individualized instruction in reading. She also discovered that the same guidelines that are in place to protect students from being placed inappropriately in a program (P.L. 94-142, Education of All Handicapped Children Act), also may act to keep children labeled if the programs that are mandated for their instruction are not effective. In that sense, the reading disabilities of such students are maintained, not alleviated.

Based on their research review of the characteristics of secondary reading LD students, Campbell and Howard (1993) discuss the fact that adolescent students with reading disabilities often have had little or no opportunity to develop reading skills

because they were probably receiving remedial instruction while their classmates were receiving developmental reading instruction. They argue that "although early intervention has helped many children with special needs, numerous adolescents continue to enter high school with disabilities" (p. 186). They also cite Mercer (1987) who suggests that unique programs are required to meet the needs of secondary students.

In his review of the educational causes of reading difficulties, Alm (1981) describes classroom atmosphere, difficult and dull reading materials, and poor teaching practices which overemphasize skills as some of the aspects of students' educational histories that contribute to reading failure. He states that the teacher has the key role in creating the atmosphere in which students learn or do not learn. Alm's assertion is supported by sociocultural theory which argues that effective learning is facilitated through the assistance of more knowledgeable members of the community and culture who can mediate understanding through language (Vygotsky, 1978). The teacher's importance in student learning will be further discussed in the section entitled "Tutoring as an Effective Intervention Model".

Alm (1981) further claims that for too many students, textbooks are too difficult, dull and frustrating to read. When teachers rely too heavily on workbooks with no opportunity for independent thinking, no creativity, and no variation, the sameness of material is stultifying both for the teacher and the children. Without careful support, many students are not successful with textbook reading.

Kos (1991) suggests that scaffolding of difficult text by the teacher is a more effective teaching approach. The students in the Kos (1991) study recalled their own educational experiences in a negative way. They described the instruction they had received as teachers telling them to sound out the words or "figure them out", assigning the same worksheets over and over again in the hope that they would eventually do them correctly, and providing packet work with very little chances for students to do actual reading. The students all perceived a lack of effectiveness with their instruction and were all aware that they were not improving. Kos contends that "Their instructional experiences often seemed irrelevant to them and distanced them from ownership of their own learning processes" (p. 892). Adams (1994) warns that to the extent that children do not read, they forfeit the practice and experience needed to make reading easier and more profitable. As a result, they can only continue to have difficulty reading, to fall farther and farther behind their peers in both reading and the conceptual returns it offers.

Phillips (1990) describes a similar scenario for his daughter and claims that the public school system made her into a disabled reader. She had experienced early reading success both at home and in kindergarten, but was placed in the low reading group in first grade after miscuing eleven words in a required story during the first week of school. Throughout elementary school she continued to receive structured remedial reading exercises which she resisted. In the upper elementary and middle grades she even found ways to avoid reading class by helping make posters and keeping score for

sports teams. Her remediation classes focused on isolated subskills and offered no real reading experiences.

Anderson (1994), in describing various types of learning disabilities, emphasizes that students with language deficits may have poor reading comprehension, and phonic analysis is a "painful" process for them. While many teachers assume that their learning disabled students need more phonics instruction, individual assessments may show this to be an inappropriate instructional plan for them. Ineffective reading behaviors appear to be directly derived from the reading instruction students receive, that is, instruction that emphasizes the use of discrete reading subskills (Kos, 1991).

Allington (1994) argues that when remediation focuses on subskills, we are lowering our expectations for literacy learning in children which results in the denial of opportunities for real reading experiences which help develop effective strategy use. These educational experiences of below level readers have resulted in the second factor in the persistence of reading failure, their lack of use of effective reading strategies.

Students' Lack of Use of Effective Reading Strategies

Reading and learning to read are essentially meaningful activities; that is, they are not passive and mechanical but purposeful and rational, dependent on the prior knowledge and expectations of the reader. Reading is a matter of making sense of written language rather than decoding print to sound (Smith, 1994). Students in remedial programs many times think of reading as sounding out the words and getting through the text as quickly as possible. Kos (1991) found that the four students she studied exhibited inconsistent and inefficient use of reading strategies. She reports that

their comprehension was negatively affected by their reliance on sounding out, and their goal was to get through the text, often at the cost of making sense. The students did not show proficiency at self-monitoring their reading. Some relied on guessing without using the context as an aid in the prediction process. The importance of the use of self-monitoring strategies in the development of reading ability is widely accepted (Allington, 1983; Clay, 1993).

In Ruddell and Unrau's (1994) model of reading, both text-processing strategies and metacognitive strategies are critical to the reader gaining meaning from text. They suggest that these strategies are stored in the form of mental schemata and hold the key to understanding text. In their review of theoretical and empirical developments in the comprehension of text structure over twenty years, Pearson and Camperell (1994) explain a study by Meyer, Brandt, and Bluth (1978), who investigated the relationship between identifying the author's organizational structure and comprehension. Ninth grade students classified as good, average, and poor readers, and those who had high vocabulary but low comprehension participated in the study. They read and recalled two different expository passages. The passages differed in their structures and also in whether or not signaling devices such as *first*, *second*, or *in contrast to* were present in the text. The results indicated that good readers organized their protocols with the same structure as that used in the passages they read even without signaling devices, and they recalled significantly more information than students who did not adopt this strategy. In addition, they found that more skilled readers are highly effective in using text structure strategies in immediate and delayed recall of text information. Poorer readers appear not

to have developed these important meaning-construction strategies or are unable to apply them in the comprehension of text.

Pearson and Camperell (1994) attest to the benefits of directly teaching text structure comprehension strategies to students. They argue that we ought to teach strategies systematically and provide opportunities for students to practice them. Adams (1994) warns that if texts are difficult in wording or structure or unfamiliar in concept, they require the active attention of the reader which can take attention away from the comprehension process. By teaching text structure patterns and the strategies used to read them, we enable students to focus more attention on comprehension.

In addition to text-processing strategies, Ruddell & Unrau (1994) argue that the reader's metacognitive strategies provide for the self-monitoring and self-correcting routines needed in the meaning-construction process. They cite the work of Cox, 1994; Cox and Sulzby, 1982; and Rowe, 1989, who noted that literacy-related metacognitive strategies such as planning, monitoring, checking, evaluating, and revising are evident in the meaning-construction process in skilled readers. Poor readers, on the other hand, are less aware of the meaning-construction process and the need to take corrective action when meaning difficulties are encountered.

In his studies of miscue analysis, Goodman (1994) also notes that the differences in the self-correction of oral reading miscues indicate that good readers use self-monitoring during reading. Ruddell & Unrau (1994) further suggest that metacognitive strategies continue to develop as the reader gains experience in comprehending text. As these strategies are applied, attention is allocated on the basis

of reading purpose, interest, and motivation. The detection of meaning "breakdowns" is central to the application of "fix-up" and other metacognitive strategies.

Students' Attitudes and Stress Related to Reading

The attitude of the student in any learning situation is of crucial importance (Alm, 1981). Alm cautions that almost universally neglected is any attention to the student's willingness, his desire to read. Students who perceive themselves as having poor ability in reading are the most likely to feel the most negative about themselves as readers.

Wigfield and Asher (1984) concluded from their literature review of the social and motivational influences on reading that the result of attributing failure to a lack of ability is that the person will not expect to succeed. Therefore, the person will give up quickly since extra effort will not overcome the person's perceived lack of ability. They note that there is a stronger impact of this expectation on older students.

Ruddell and Unrau (1994) emphasize that affective conditions directly influence the reader's decision to read. They state that motivation and attitude toward reading and content shape the direction and intensity of the reader's interest in reading. Mathewson (1994) defines motivation to read as the "development of conditions promoting intention to read" (p. 1138). If children or adults are not moved by the need or desire to read, reading will be put off for other more compelling pursuits. In addition, Mathewson indicates that strategy use is also influenced by the reader's motivation to read and attitude toward reading and content. These influences take the form of the reader's intent to construct meaning based on a given text and to persist in this effort.

Covington (1992) asserts that perceived self-worth strongly affects the degree to which the student becomes an effective learner in the instructional setting. An extension of this supposition is offered by Ruddell and Unrau (1994) when they predict that students who have high self-esteem and who are learning in a reward-rich environment are more likely to engage in learning to read and in self-directed reading. The reverse expectation is present for students who have low self-esteem and trying to learn in an environment with little praise or encouragement. Intrinsic motivations, Ruddell and Unrau explain, are based within the belief and value system of the reader, and include satisfaction with one's achievement, reinforcement of self-worth, and the expectation of reading enjoyment.

Kos (1991) observes that the students in her study suffered anxiety due to their reading difficulties. They made various comments that revealed their worry about facing ridicule, their feelings of discomfort while reading, and their concern about their ability to do daily tasks and future employment opportunities due to their reading difficulties. Kos indicates that years of frustration and confusion and feelings of inadequacy in reading may have contributed to inappropriate behaviors by students, which in turn became a focus for the school instead of reading instruction.

Moniuszko (1992) describes remedial readers as "students who would rather do anything except pick up a book. They act as though they are being punished when assigned reading" (p. 32). She observes that this aversion has an adverse impact on other subject areas and depletes self-esteem. Her students are frustrated by their inability to read fluently and embarrassed by the resulting academic inadequacies.

Moniuszko maintains that the key to teaching reading is meaning. As a classroom teacher of remedial reading in a middle school, she became aware that if she provided reading materials and other resources about topics that students were interested in, they became motivated to read and learn. She describes an interest inventory which she gave her students that asked for their favorite things to do, what they would do to fill an hour if they couldn't do their favorite things, animals they were interested in, TV shows they watch, sports, careers, and travel that they would be interested in. She found from this activity that when given the opportunity to read about relevant subjects that they value, students will choose to read. Their ability will develop, enhancing self-esteem and their desire to engage in reading as an independent, lifelong activity.

Children do not learn to read who do not want to, or who see no point in doing so, or who are hostile to the teacher, or to the school, or to the social or cultural group to which they perceive the teacher and the school as belonging. Children do not learn to read who expect to fail, or who believe that learning to read will be too costly, or whose preferred image of themselves, for whatever reason, is that of a nonreader (Smith ,1994, p. 211).

One possible reason that some students may fit this description is that they do not learn in the traditional ways of school. Their individual needs prevent them from being successful when those needs are not met.

The Individual Needs of Students

Probably the greatest flaw in instruction which can lead to reading failure is to neglect the fact that students in a class are so different from each other in so many ways

(Alm, 1981). Kos (1991) cautions that schools are likely to encounter more and more students who do not learn well from traditional forms of instruction and who are likely to develop reading difficulties unless changes occur in their educational experiences.

Anderson (1994) discusses the differences in learning disabilities that students may have and how the disabilities manifest themselves in ways unique to the student. He suggests that remedial interventions are most effective if done individually rather than in a class in order to meet individual learning needs. Anderson asserts that "children do not outgrow learning disabilities. Not just elementary teachers but also those working with adolescents and adults will need to take into account the variations in learning deficits if they want to modify their teaching procedures for LD learners" (p. 137). Morawski (1992) states that the complex nature of a student's reading and writing difficulties can make their remediation a demanding task. If remediation is to be truly effective, then it must be based on a holistic assessment that addresses a student's individual reading and writing abilities and needs as well as any factors which may be influencing their development.

The attitudes of the students in Kos' study (1991) revealed that they recognized the ineffectiveness of the instruction they were receiving. They knew that repetition of teaching methods that were not working for them did no good. The students' instructional experiences often seemed irrelevant to them and distanced them from ownership of their own learning processes. They sensed that they learned differently and knew that their learning needs were not being met. Moniuszko (1992) found that surveying her students for their individual interests provided topics for classroom

activities that resulted in a high level of motivation, eagerness, enthusiasm, and a willingness to read independently. Alm (1981) suggests that recognizing differences and modifying teaching practices is an enormous task that is both complex and continuous. Clay (1993) says that only by observation can we see the individual needs of children, and that the best process for progress among struggling readers is one-to-one interactions.

Part of the individual differences that students have also relates to the way they fit or do not fit in with the perceived culture of the school. When students feel that they are different than the rest of the students in school and do not do things the way that others in school do them, it creates a mismatch that prevents them from progressing.

The Mismatch with School Culture

Sociocultural theorists would agree with Smith (1994) that students often feel that they don't fit the school culture and may choose not to participate in activities that they perceive are part of that culture, such as reading. Gee (1996) suggests that students may have to adjust their identity kit of their social genres (the ways of talking, interacting, thinking, feeling, and believing) to fit the school culture if they are to be successful. Teachers have the responsibility to assist students in this endeavor while not making them feel that they must deny their own culture.

Issues of power and privilege enter into this complicated concern. Gee (1996) would ask us to examine our social practices in school and eliminate those practices and beliefs which may be harmful to others. Allington (1994) contends that the notion of differential standards for different children has a long history in American education.

He claims that it is simply not necessary that some children fail to learn to read well. He argues that "it is time to reject the notion that only a few children can learn to read and write well" (p. 15). This notion "has virtually ensured some children would not receive instruction sufficient to develop their potential as literacy learners" (p. 15).

Summary

In this section, a review of literature concerning the persistence of reading failure has highlighted some of the causes for middle school students remaining at-risk in reading even after receiving remedial assistance for many years. Five causes were discussed: students' educational histories, students' lack of use of effective reading strategies, students' attitudes and stress related to reading, the individual needs of students, and the mismatch of students with school culture. The combination of these factors serves to inform the educational community of practices in the school system itself which may be contributing to the failure of at-risk adolescents.

The following section will serve to explain reading as a transactive process. The implications of understanding this process leads to the development of alternative teaching practices which facilitate effective learning rather than the ineffective practices described in the previous section.

Reading as a Transactive Process

Reading is a transactive process in which meaning is dynamic, not static, as the individual, the text, and the context change during the transaction (Goodman, 1994; Rosenblatt, 1978, 1994; Ruddell & Unrau, 1994; Smith, 1994). The implication for teachers of remedial students is that reading instruction for remedial readers must

change to reflect that transactive process. "The teaching of reading and writing at any developmental level should have as its first concern the creation of environments and activities in which students are motivated and encouraged to draw on their own resources to make 'live' meanings" (Rosenblatt, 1994, p. 1082).

Reading and learning to read are essentially meaningful activities; that is, they are not passive and mechanical but purposeful and rational, dependent on the prior knowledge and expectations of the reader. If, according to Smith (1994), reading is a matter of making sense of written language rather than decoding print to sound, the implications for teachers of remedial students are clear. Smith asserts that meaningless drills and exercises, the relating of letters to sounds, and the decomposition of words to letters can be incomprehensible and can make learning to read a complicated and nonsensical task. He states that learning to read results from practical and meaningful interactions between teachers and students, rather than from exercises and drills. The traditional reading programs in which discrete subskills in reading are emphasized only serve to widen the gap between the reading level of the at-risk reader and the level at which he or she should be reading.

Language is basic to the transactional model of reading (Rosenblatt, 1994). Vygotsky (1978) explained language as the psychological tool for mediating understanding. Rosenblatt (1994) explains that "we 'make sense' of a new situation or transaction and make new meanings by applying, reorganizing, revising, or extending public and private elements selected from our personal linguistic-experiential reservoirs" (p. 1061). A conversation is a transaction whereby each participant comes

with a personal linguistic-experiential reservoir. This transaction also can occur between a reader and a text, which is composed of the language of the author and represented by the signs on the page, or the text (Rosenblatt, 1994).

Rosenblatt (1994) further describes the reading process as a total dynamic situation in which the reader and the text transact. She argues that "the 'meaning' does not reside ready-made 'in' the text or 'in' the reader but happens or comes into being during the transaction between reader and text" (p. 1063). Consistent with the theory of constructivism, this transaction is the means by which the reader constructs meaning. Goodman (1994) suggests that the characteristics of the writer, the characteristics of the text, and the characteristics of the reader will all influence the meaning that is constructed. He describes reading as "meaning seeking, tentative, selective, and constructive" (p. 1114).

Another factor in the process of reading is the notion of the reader's stance (Rosenblatt, 1994). The reading event must fall on a continuum determined by what Rosenblatt terms a "predominantly aesthetic" stance or a "predominately efferent" stance (p. 1066). The efferent stance is the kind of reading in which "attention is centered predominantly on what is to be extracted and retained after the reading event" (p. 1066). This type of reading is often what is assigned in school. When a teacher assigns reading for the purpose of students learning certain facts for a test or to answer questions, the student must take the efferent stance to accomplish the task assigned. Often, informational reading leads to the completion of an assignment rather than to

satisfy the needs or curiosity of the student and does not give the student a clear idea about how to use the information that is obtained (Goodman, 1994).

In the aesthetic stance, "the reader adopts an attitude of readiness to focus attention on what is being lived through during the reading event" (Rosenblatt, 1994, p. 1067). This stance has more to do with the affective response to reading. The sensations, feelings, images, emotions, and ideas which result in enjoyment of reading are the focus. "Efferent and aesthetic apply, then, to the writer's and the reader's selective attitude toward their own streams of consciousness, during their respective linguistic events" (Rosenblatt, 1994, p. 1067).

The implications for teaching and interacting with students during reading events are clear. Rosenblatt (1994) argues that teaching should be concerned with the ability of the individual to generate meaning in the reading event. One aim of teaching that is important in this process is to attend to enriching the students' linguistic-experiential reservoir. Teachers should carefully scrutinize the organization of their instruction, the atmosphere in the classroom, the kinds of questions they ask, and the types of tests they administer (Rosenblatt, 1994).

Goodman (1994) emphasizes that it is the search for meaning that unifies the use of the strategies and cycles that the reading process requires, which is why aspects of the reading process and how it works lead to the ultimate goal of construction of meaning. "Learning to read involves getting the process together. That's harder if instruction takes it apart" (p. 1128).

Speech is vital to the transactions between students, teachers, and text (Rosenblatt, 1994). Rosenblatt purports that dialogue between teacher and student can foster the reading process and can help students develop insights concerning transactions with texts as well as understanding reading skills and strategies as they are used in meaningful contexts.

To facilitate the need for dialogue between student and teacher, the present study occurs in a one-to-one setting. The next section will review the literature concerning tutoring as an effective intervention model to demonstrate that research shows the power of working with students one-to-one.

Tutoring as an Effective Intervention Model

Vygotsky's (1978) work concerning the zone of proximal development and language as a tool for mediating learning parallels the need for teachers to work as a "more knowledgeable other" with students individually. The most effective form of instruction known is one-to-one tutoring when it is done by qualified teachers (Wong, Groth, & O'Flahavan, 1994).

Much work has been done on the effectiveness of various one-to-one tutoring programs which has shown considerable evidence supporting the superiority of tutoring to other types of intervention (Gaustad, 1992). Pinnell (1989) states that even in the best classroom situations, some children have problems with reading and writing. It seems clear that some children need special help. Wasik and Slavin (1993) reviewed five programs which incorporate one-to-one tutoring. In describing these programs, they discuss the model of reading to which each program subscribes and identify the key

components of reading found in each program. The five programs they reviewed were Reading Recovery, Success for All, Prevention of Learning Disabilities, Wallach Tutoring Program, and Programmed Tutorial Reading. To review the programs, Wasik and Slavin used a set of procedures called best-evidence synthesis, which combines elements of meta-analysis with those of traditional narrative reviews. Studies were included in the review if they evaluated one-to-one instruction delivered by adults to students in the first grade who were learning to read for the first time. Sixteen studies met the inclusion criteria for their review, and these studies evaluated a total of five tutoring programs which were then included in their review. Wasik and Slavin found that all forms of tutoring they studied were more effective than any other strategy, including instruction given to small groups.

One of the most important elements of the Success for All model is the use of one-to-one tutoring (Madden, Slavin, Wasik, & Dolan, 1997). Tutors in this program work with students for 20-minute sessions and support students' success in the regular reading curriculum, rather than teaching different objectives. The tutors are trained, certified teachers. Madden, Slavin, Wasik, & Dolan (1997) claim that the research on Success for All shows that "reading failure is unnecessary for the great majority of children" (p. 125).

Clay (1993) argues that a major problem in thinking about what school organization will improve the quality of instruction is the individual learner versus the group instruction dilemma. She claims that the best progress for a particular child will result from individual instruction. Clay further recognizes that teachers cannot justify

teaching all children on the assumption that all need the same kind of teaching. In Reading Recovery, certain children are taught individually to remediate early reading problems and help those children who are clearly getting left behind by the end of their first year at school. Allington (1994) reports that even those who have led the way in the development of early intensive intervention, such as Clay, admit that the powerful demonstrated potential of such remediation was surprising. The "recovery" of so many young readers experiencing difficulty in such short periods of time caused us to question traditional practices of special education. Allington further claims that rather than slowing instruction down and making it more concrete, remedial instruction is more effective when it is intensive and accelerated.

Lee and Neal (1993) adapted Clay's intensive one-to-one approach for a middle school student. David, their student, had no physical or emotional factors which may have been influencing his poor reading achievement, yet his eighth grade resource teacher indicated that she had never worked with a student who was so devoid of reading or comprehension skills. Rather than label David at-risk, Lee and Neal decided he was "at-promise." They administered an informal reading inventory for a miscue analysis and to determine his independent and instructional levels. He experienced frustration on the level one passage, so they included letter identification and a dictation task in their assessment. They also used a "think aloud" and the Metacomprehension Strategy Index (Schmitt, 1990). Results from both of these assessments indicated that David was functioning at the letter and word analysis level of reading and had no awareness of other strategies for gaining meaning from print, although his

comprehension was at level nine when passages were read to him. He also showed high stress factors related to his reading. Lee and Neal selected Clay's (1985) Reading Recovery model to adapt to their middle school student's needs. They called their model "Reading Rescue" and included several components similar to Reading Recovery, such as reading familiar material, reading aloud to the student, taking a running record, working with words and letters, working through language experience, and reading new material. David was tutored for two 1-hour sessions per week for fifteen weeks. On the post-assessments, David attained instructional level three and showed that he used a range of strategies to cope with unfamiliar words and to gain meaning from print. In addition, he developed metacognitive behaviors and showed a significantly lower level of stress when reading. They found their reading rescue model to be highly successful in building the student's confidence and fluency.

Ballash (1994) claimed that her adaptation of Clay's strategies for use with a high school student was also very successful. Using Lee and Neal's (1993) experience with a middle school student as a model, she studied Yazmin, a first-generation Arab American, to see if she could get the same results with a high school remedial reader. She attempted to match text to Yazmin's ability and interest and chose MacLachlan's *Sarah, Plain and Tall* and *Shabanu Daughter of the Wind* for reading materials. Ballash gave Yazmin a Reading Miscue Inventory to closely analyze her reading, then began to follow a format similar to that of Lee and Neal (1993). She had Yazmin reread familiar material, she took running records, and she read aloud to Yazmin. She had mini-lessons on skills or vocabulary taken from context and then read new material. She also

incorporated a Language Experience Approach using the computer for writing activities. The difference that Ballash saw between her model and Reading Recovery was that Reading Recovery was designed to prevent failure and loss of self-esteem before it occurs. "High school remedial readers have been down so long it's hard for them to be positive" (p. 686). Ballash found that sharing the running records with Yazmin and pointing out the strategies she was using effectively helped to make her more metacognitively aware. She enjoyed reading aloud to her student and taking that opportunity to think aloud, share visualizations, and make predictions. She felt that her work with Yazmin was very successful, as Yazmin became aware of her strengths and began to build upon them.

Examination of research on tutoring as an intervention model reveals three common areas in which tutoring was shown to be effective: academic achievement, emotional support and positive role models, and attitude toward subject matter (Anderson, 1994; Clay, 1993; Gaustad, 1992; Juel, 1996; Vygotsky, 1978; Wasik & Slavin, 1993). In their meta-analysis of the educational outcomes of tutoring, Cohen, Kulik, and Kulik (1982) state that studies that have focused on the learning gains brought about by one-to-one tutoring conclude that tutoring programs contribute to the academic growth of children who receive tutoring, especially in well structured tutoring programs.

Smith (1994) states that:

My early researches persuaded me that learning to read resulted from practical and meaningful interactions between teachers and students, rather than from

exercises and drills... the essential element in literacy instruction is the teacher.

Literacy is not accomplished through the external controls of prescribed programs and formalized tests but through sensitive teachers who understand what they teach and who also understand the students for whose learning they are responsible (p. ix).

Matthews (1993) warns that to be effective, tutors must be trained to understand the reading process. Making tutors aware of the participatory, sociocultural nature of reading and learning is crucial to successful tutoring. Hock, Schumaker, & Deshler (1995) also point out that formal training of tutors is a necessary component for a tutoring program to be effective, as tutors do not automatically use good teaching strategies.

In programs which utilize volunteer tutors, it is one thing to provide volunteers with techniques they can use with children who read at a first-grade level; it is quite another to provide them with the variety of techniques and the knowledge required to work successfully with readers at a multitude of other grade levels (Morris, Shaw & Perney, 1990). Wasik and Slavin (1993) point out that merely providing tutoring doesn't guarantee success. Success depends on the skill and training of the tutor and the quality of the instructional materials.

The most significant aspect of the success of Reading Recovery is the fact that the instruction is done by highly trained teachers (Pinnell, 1989). Many volunteer tutoring programs are currently being encouraged in our schools. Volunteer tutors do a fine job of giving individual attention to students and providing extended reading time

and practice. However, the needs of upper level students who have persistent reading difficulties must be met by trained reading specialists.

One fear teachers and especially administrators encounter in the implementation of programs which use one-to-one configurations is the perceived high cost of such programs. Gaustad (1992) reviews several tutoring programs that report their cost effectiveness. Her conclusion is that an analysis of costs and benefits may reveal that, over time, an initially expensive program is a worthwhile investment. The cost of retaining a student, for example, can be very expensive. The cost of tutoring certainly appears in a different perspective when compared with the long-range costs of school failure to the district and the community. Juel (1996) purports that despite criticisms, the benefits of tutoring remain a powerful enticement to provide one-to-one tutoring to those who need it.

Another very successful one-to-one model is based on the cognitive apprenticeship model (Rogoff, 1990). The next section of this review of literature will serve as a background and rationale for using a reading apprenticeship model in this study.

Reading Apprenticeship

Cognitive apprenticeship is based on two beliefs. The first is that skilled reading involves complex interactions between the reader's strategies, knowledge, and the text. The second is that isolating a strategy distorts it, making it difficult to use in real reading (Stahl, 1997). In cognitive apprenticeship, texts are treated holistically, using all appropriate strategies simultaneously. The use of social interaction as a model for

desired comprehension is an important component. The teacher in the cognitive apprenticeship provides a great deal of scaffolding, and then gradually transfers control to the learner (Stahl, 1997).

Rogoff (1990) formulated a cognitive apprenticeship model in which the thought processes of a "more knowledgeable other" are made explicit and available for internalization by a novice through dialogue embedded in the joint accomplishment of an authentic task. Based on the more general cognitive apprenticeship model, Knapp (1998) developed a reading apprenticeship. She asserts that the reading apprenticeship is "based in Vygotskian social learning theory, grounded in the belief that children learn best through social interaction in the context of joint efforts to accomplish an entire meaningful task, rather than through directed drill and practice of small steps" (p. 3).

The reading apprenticeship has several attributes that address some of the causes of persistence of reading failure indicated in the first section of this review of literature. First, the model of instruction created by the reading apprenticeship is one of collaboration and a holistic approach to text. Far from the isolated subskills approach of many traditional remedial programs, the reading apprenticeship encourages the use of strategies in orchestration. Dorn, French, & Jones (1998) stress that we cannot design a program for low-achieving children based on a deficit model of learning. The reading apprenticeship model has as its basis a constructivist approach in which the learner takes an active role in the construction of knowledge with the scaffolding provided by the teacher's modeling, guiding and coaching (Winsor & Hettinger, 1998).

Strategy instruction is part of the reading apprenticeship model through the pairing of the unskilled reader with a more competent, knowledgeable other for the modeling and supportive practice of reading skills and strategies (Winsor & Hettinger, 1998). Rogoff (1990) emphasizes the importance of social interaction for stimulating cognitive growth. She views children as apprentices in learning who acquire a diverse collection of skills and knowledge through the guidance and support of more knowledgeable others. In the apprenticeship approach, the teacher and student work together in constructing a meaningful interaction which results in higher levels of understanding. Dorn, French, & Jones (1998) explain that this approach places an importance on "explicit demonstrations and active engagements that are capable of awakening and guiding the child's literacy development to a higher level" (p. 5).

The damaging negative attitudes and stress associated with reading failure can be dealt with during a reading apprenticeship. Crowder (1998) investigated the relationships between reading partners in reading apprenticeships and found that the adult partner modeled a pleasure in reading and expressive reading as well as strategic skills. The social context of the reading apprenticeship allows for the development of social aspects of trust and shared meaning making. Juel (1996) found that all successful tutoring partnerships had a bond of caring as a component of the relationship. The adults in Crowder's (1998) study viewed trust as an element which allowed the child to relax and take chances in the apprenticeship. Knapp (1998) claims that the reading apprenticeship results in increased self-efficacy then increases the child's motivation and willingness to take risks in the pursuit of further learning which in turn facilitates

additional learning and success. "This ever-increasing spiral of learning and achievement is the opposite side of the coin from the downward trend described as more typical of poor readers; it is the part of the 'Matthew Effect' (Stanovich, 1986) that explains why 'the rich get richer'" (p. 3).

The final two factors that relate to persistent reading failure were the individual needs of students and their perceived mismatch with school. In a reading apprenticeship model, the teacher has the opportunity to assess the student continuously using authentic, meaningful reading events and to work within the student's zone of proximal development (Knapp, 1998). Rather than using a predetermined program of instruction, the teacher in the reading apprenticeship makes decisions regarding instruction based on the individual need of the student and where the student is currently working independently. The teacher then works to elevate the thinking of the student to a higher level using scaffolding of reading strategies and modeling good reading behaviors (Dorn, French, & Jones, 1998). The goal is for the identity kit of a good reader to be modeled and discussed by the teacher and to be eventually internalized by the student.

During the reading apprenticeship, an important component is the modeling and scaffolding of reading strategies. The last section of this chapter will review the literature concerning reading strategies that have been shown to be successful for below level readers and their use to improve reading achievement. The purpose of this information is to document sources for the researcher's decisions concerning choices of reading strategies to model and teach during the reading apprenticeship.

Reading Strategies

This section is divided into four parts to reflect different categories of reading strategies that were modeled and taught during the reading apprenticeship for this study: decoding strategies, comprehension strategies, vocabulary-building strategies, and test-taking strategies. Each part will describe specific strategies that were taught and modeled at some time during the reading apprenticeship and will cite the sources from which the strategies were derived for use by the researcher as participant observer in the study.

Decoding Strategies

Reading is a matter of making sense of written language rather than decoding print to sound (Smith, 1994). The goal of decoding is to become a fluent reader in order to gain meaning from text. For readers who do not make the transition to fluent reading, the result can negatively affect subsequent reading progress (Allington, 1983). In the reading apprenticeship, language is the tool for mediating learning (Vygotsky, 1978). Language prompts from the tutor, therefore, serve to scaffold the thinking processes that assist decoding. Dorn, French, and Jones (1998) list language prompts that help readers integrate cues and promote self-monitoring during reading, such as:

- Does that make sense?
- Does that sound right?
- Does that look right?
- What else can you do?
- Read it again and see if you can figure out what is wrong here.

- Do you know something about that word that can help you? (p. 17)

Language prompts are also part of the recommended strategy for Reading Recovery (Clay, 1993). The purpose of prompting is to develop the student's abilities to search for all types of cues to develop fluency in decoding. Examples of prompts recommended by Clay are:

- You said.....Can we say it that way? (syntax)
- You said....Does that make sense? (semantics)
- Does it look right? (graphic cues)
- What can you hear? (phonemic cues) (p. 42)

The goal of this prompting is to help the reader to monitor his or her own reading, search for cues in word sequences, in meaning and in letter sequences, to cross-check one source of cues with another, to self-correct, and to solve new words by these means (Clay, 1993).

For the older reader who encounters longer and more difficult words, additional strategies may be needed. Syllabication is a method of dividing words into syllables or pronounceable units that contain a vowel or vowel-like sound (Crawley & Merritt, 1996). "Students may learn the pronunciation of longer words more easily by dividing them into syllables. Mastery of the dictionary syllabication should not be the goal. Instead, words should be divided so they can be pronounced" (p. 26). A language prompt that assists the use of this strategy may be:

- What small words or chunks do you see in the large word?
- Can you divide that word up and pronounce the parts?

The purpose of using decoding strategies is to become a more fluent reader in order to gain meaning from text. In addition to decoding strategies, the student can learn strategies to use that will enhance comprehension. The next section will review comprehension strategies that have been shown to be effective.

Comprehension Strategies

Reading comprehension is an example of a less-structured task that cannot be broken down into a fixed sequence of subtasks (Rosenshine & Meister, 1997).

A cognitive strategy is not a direct procedure; it is not an algorithm to be precisely followed. Rather, a cognitive strategy is a heuristic that serves to support or facilitate the learner as she or he develops internal procedures that enable them to perform the higher level operations (p. 86).

Teaching cognitive strategies is a process of scaffolding the student while he or she learns the strategy, and then the cognitive strategy supports the student as the student attempts to complete the task of comprehension. The teaching of cognitive strategies is an example of working within the student's zone of proximal development (Rosenshine & Meister, 1997).

"Dialogue has a critical role to play in scaffolded instruction, facilitating the collaboration necessary between the novice and expert for the novice to acquire the cognitive strategy or strategies" (Palincsar, 1986, p. 95). Thinking aloud is a way for the teacher to model the thought processes important to comprehension (Rosenshine & Meister, 1997). Cognitive strategies that can be illustrated through the dialogue of thinking aloud include clarifying difficult statements or concepts (I don't get this.),

summarizing important information (These are the most important ideas so far.), and thinking ahead (I'll predict...) (Anderson, 1991). Thinking aloud by the teacher provides novice learners with a way to observe expert thinking which is usually hidden from the student (Rosenshine & Meister, 1997).

Another cognitive strategy that can be illustrated by the expert through dialogue is the use of fix-up strategies. This refers to strategies that students can use when they realize, through metacognitive processes, that their comprehension is not proceeding well. Fix-up strategies can include rereading the difficult portion of text, reading ahead to see if the problems clear up, and consulting an expert source such as a teacher, parent, or peer (Rosenshine & Meister, 1997).

Bereiter and Bird (1985) identified fix-up strategies used by adult expert readers and selected four that they concurred could be taught. The first strategy they called restatement. When text is difficult, it can be rephrased in simpler or more familiar terms. The second was backtracking. This involves looking back and resuming reading at some point previously passed to clarify confusion. The third strategy involved generating anticipatory questions when the reader suspects missing information will be supplied at a later point in the text, then recognizing the needed information when it appears. The final strategy discussed by Bereiter and Bird involved problem formulation. Formulating some difficulty in comprehension as a problem permitted the reader to bring into play general problem-solving procedures that are not normally activated during reading. "A condition for activating any of these strategies is the recognition of something unsatisfactory in the meaning being constructed from the text"

(p. 136). Students who received treatment including instruction that identified, modeled, and explained the strategies, and were provided with opportunities to practice, increased their use of these strategies and showed gains in reading comprehension.

Clay (1993) asserts that there is a particular opportunity for revision and reworking in the one-to-one teaching situation. The student and teacher can talk about the reading as it occurs. Through language prompts, the teacher can assist the student in integrating various sources of information and applying strategies for working out new solutions (Dorn, French, & Jones, 1998).

In addition to decoding and comprehension, the development of vocabulary is a characteristic of a reader capable of making sense of text (Goodman, 1994). The next section will briefly describe building vocabulary through dialogue.

Vocabulary-Building Strategies

It is a mistake to think that vocabulary-building exercises can produce improved comprehension. Language is learned in the context of its use. Word meanings are built in relationship to concepts; language facilitates learning, but it is the conceptual development that creates the need for the language. Without that, words are empty forms. So vocabulary is built in the course of language use, including reading (Goodman, 1994, p. 1127).

Building vocabulary in the reading apprenticeship, therefore, is best achieved through dialogue. To be an independent reader, the student must be encouraged to search for links between new words and words he already knows (Clay, 1993).

The reading apprenticeship engages the student in reading a lot of text, a good deal more than most poor readers are exposed to in school (Allington, 1983; Knapp, 1998). This increased exposure to text is the first step in building vocabulary. In addition to the amount of text, the reading apprenticeship promotes dialogue between the teacher and the student about unfamiliar words when they are encountered in authentic text. The discussion that occurs serves to build the conceptual schema of vocabulary for the student and thus builds authentic vocabulary knowledge.

Ruddell (1994) asserts that social interactions that influence language development and comprehension also influence vocabulary learning. Drum and Madison (1985) used a conversational approach to vocabulary learning with adolescents working with tutors and found that the discussions were highly interactive and successful in building vocabulary.

The final category of strategies that will be discussed in this section is test-taking strategies. "Standardized tests are a fixture in most U.S schools, but they evoke widespread misgivings among both teachers and researchers" (Hiebert & Calfee, 1992, p. 71). In the state in which this study was conducted, the state mandated test indeed evokes much misgiving as well as stress among students as well as teachers. With local district policies that prohibit students in grades three, five, and eight from advancing to the next grade level unless passing scores are demonstrated on the state test, concern is extremely high. The thought of Gee's notion of identity kits for the way things are done in cultures led to noticing that many students lack the "test-wiseness" (Scruggs & Mastropieri, 1995) that was apparent among the students who had previously

demonstrated passing scores on the state test. The decision was made to include test-taking strategies in the reading apprenticeship for this study.

Test-taking Strategies

Scruggs and Mastropieri (1995) distinguish between teaching test-taking skills and teaching to the test. They argue that test-taking skills training involves teaching directly to the format or other conditions of testing, while teaching to the test refers to directly teaching specific items which will appear on the test. Since the test in this state is kept very confidential and no one knows what reading passages will appear nor the questions that will be asked, teaching to the test is actually impossible. However, past tests are released at the end of each year, and teachers can be aware of the types of questions that are asked as well as the format of the test.

Some test-taking strategies for reading comprehension tests are suggested by Scruggs and Mastropieri (1995). First, students should read the entire reading passage even if they encounter unfamiliar words. "They should be encouraged to read past unfamiliar words to retain as much meaning as possible" (p. 57). Scruggs and Mastropieri found that even with several difficult words omitted from the passage, students were still able to derive meaning from the passage and answer many comprehension questions.

Another strategy is to read each question and all of the answer choices (Scruggs & Mastropieri, 1995). If students read the questions before reading the passage, they set a purpose for reading. Often students choose incorrect answers because they haven't read or understood what the question is asking them to do.

In addition, students should be taught to refer back to the passage to confirm the evidence for their answer (Scruggs and Mastropieri, 1995). The QAR strategy (Raphael, 1986) is an important strategy for students to answer questions from the six objective areas on the state test. The six objectives tested are 1) word meaning, 2) supporting ideas, 3) main idea and summarization, 4) relationships and outcomes, 5) generalizations and inferences, and 6) point of view, propaganda, and fact and opinion. With the QAR strategy, students identify questions as Right There, Think and Search, On my Own, and Author and Me. Examples of Right There questions are found within the test objective of supporting detail questions, word meaning questions, and fact and opinion questions. Think and Search and Author and Me questions are found in the main idea and summarization, generalizations and inferences, and point of view and propaganda questions. There are never any On my Own questions on the state test, because all questions are passage dependent. When students can think of themselves as detectives, knowing that there will always be clues in the reading passage to lead them to the correct answer, they become empowered to answer questions confidently.

Dialogue between the teacher and the student in the reading apprenticeship serves as the critical tool for modeling test-taking strategies. The goal is to promote self-monitoring by the student to use the strategies. Questions can be modeled for the student with the goal of becoming internalized for self-monitoring during the test. Such questions may include:

- Is that what the whole paragraph/passage is about? (main idea and summarization)

- Does that tell something that happened in the beginning, middle and end of the passage? (summarization)
- Would that meaning make sense in the sentence? (word meaning)
- Does this word remind me of any other words I know? (word meaning)
- Do I know the meaning of any parts of this word? (word meaning)
- Does the title of the passage give me a clue? (main idea, inferences)
- Where did it talk about ... in the passage so I can find a clue? (supporting ideas, generalizations, inferences)
- Where are the other clues I can put together? (inferences and generalizations)
- What is the author of this passage trying to get me to see? (points of view, author's purpose, propaganda)
- How did the author structure this text? (author's purpose)

By internalizing dialogue, students become more test-wise and better test-takers. They are able to self-monitor their comprehension during the test and be confident that answer choices will be decided with reasoning rather than randomly.

Summary

To provide a background and rationale for this study which explores the interactions that take place during a reading apprenticeship which facilitate the learning of reading strategies by adolescent students who are at the middle school level and are still at-risk for reading failure, the review of literature included six areas. The first was an overview of the theoretical framework which undergirds the study and establishes the philosophical orientation of the researcher. Second was a review of literature

concerning the persistence of reading failure which explored some of the causes for middle school students remaining at-risk in reading even after receiving remedial assistance for many years. Within this section, five causes were discussed: students' educational histories, students' lack of use of effective reading strategies, students' attitudes and stress related to reading, the individual needs of students, and the mismatch of students with school culture.

Next was a discussion of reading as a transactive process, which suggested alternative teaching practices to the ineffective instruction indicated in the first section. Then, studies involving tutoring as an effective intervention model were reviewed because the dissertation study was done in a one-to-one setting. The fifth section narrowed the tutoring model to discuss specifically the reading apprenticeship model of tutoring which was the model used for this study.

Finally, a review of the literature regarding reading strategies that have been shown to be successful for below level readers was included to document sources for the researcher's decisions concerning choices of reading strategies to model and teach during the reading apprenticeship. To conclude this chapter, the research questions are restated.

Research Questions

This qualitative study is designed as a case study. I seek to answer the following questions regarding the facilitation of learning by adolescent students in the environment of a reading apprenticeship:

- 1) How will a reading apprenticeship impact reading achievement in the area of fluency?
- 2) How will a reading apprenticeship impact reading achievement in the area of comprehension?
- 3) How will a reading apprenticeship impact reading achievement in the area of vocabulary development?
- 4) How will a reading apprenticeship impact the self-perception of the reader?
- 5) What reading strategies were directly or indirectly taught or modeled during the reading apprenticeship?
- 6) What are the nature of the interactions that seem to be the most important in facilitating the learning during a reading apprenticeship?

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to explore the interactions that take place during a reading apprenticeship that facilitate the learning of reading strategies by adolescent students who are at the middle school level and are still at-risk for reading failure and to investigate how a reading apprenticeship affects reading achievement in the areas of fluency, vocabulary development, comprehension, and the self-perception of the reader.

Research Design

The design of this study was a qualitative case study which was descriptive and interpretive in nature (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996; Merriam, 1988). It included two cases which were investigated simultaneously. The units of analysis, or the "bounded system" (p. 45), were two students, each of whom was part of a one-to-one reading apprenticeship. The researcher served as participant observer in both cases and was the teacher in each of the one-to-one reading apprenticeships. The reading apprenticeship took place for 45 minutes two days per week for 16 weeks. One was before school from 7:00 to 7:45 on Mondays and Wednesdays, and the other after school from 3:15 to 4:00 on Tuesdays and Thursdays. The afternoon session eventually moved from after school to the last period of the day, 2:20 to 3:10. The reading apprenticeships began the second semester of the school year in January, and concluded at the end of the semester during

May.

Because this was primarily a qualitative case study, the sampling method was nonprobability sampling. The two students were chosen purposefully. "Purposive sampling is based on the assumption that one wants to discover, understand, gain insight; therefore one needs to select a sample from which one can learn the most" (Merriam, 1988, p. 48).

The primary data set was qualitative in nature and included videotapes of twenty-one sessions with one student and twenty-two sessions with the second student. Five sessions for each student, selected across the time span of the study, were transcribed. Also included were student interviews, teacher questionnaires, parent questionnaires, running records, and journal reflections by the researcher/teacher of each session. Additionally, there were elements of quantitative data, including state test scores and informal reading inventory scores. Data from these sources provided "thick description" (Merriam, 1988, p. 27) and "triangulation" (p. 69). "The opportunity to use multiple methods of data collection is a major strength of case study research" (p. 69).

Subjects

The subjects in this study were two students who attended the same middle school where the researcher/teacher is a Reading Specialist. Both of the students were in eighth grade. One student, Juanita (pseudonym), was female, age 14 years 3 months, and the other, Ben (pseudonym) was male, age 14 years 5 months. Juanita was of Hispanic ethnicity and lived with her mother and her grandmother. Ben was of mixed Caucasian and African-American ethnicity and lived with his mother. Neither student

had brothers or sisters living at home.

The middle school had a student population of approximately 560 students and was one of four middle schools in the district. The district was located in the suburbs of a large metropolitan area in a southern state. The ethnic distribution of the middle school was 2.3% African-American, 8.4% Hispanic, 88.2% White, .7% Asian, and .4% Native American. Ten percent of students were economically disadvantaged. When compared to the demographics of the district as a whole, this middle school had slightly higher percentages of minority and economically disadvantaged students.

Students were chosen to participate in the study based on several factors. Both students had failed the state reading test in the prior year, Ben with a Learning Index of 58 and Juanita with a Learning Index of 56. A Learning Index of 70 is required for a passing score. The Learning Index is an indicator which is used by the state to show one year's growth for each testing grade. The scale is not an actual percentage of correct answers, but runs within two to four points of the actual percentage correct. Juanita and Ben were both enrolled in the district required Eighth Grade Reading class because they had failed the state test and had also scored below grade level on the standardized achievement test, which was the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS), given during seventh grade. Ben scored a grade equivalency of 4.3 on vocabulary and 5.1 on comprehension, for a total reading grade equivalency of 4.8. Juanita scored a grade equivalency of 4.8 on vocabulary and comprehension, which resulted in a total reading grade equivalency of 4.8. Neither Juanita nor Ben were identified to receive Special Education services because of their cognitive ability scores which were taken from the ITBS. Ben's seventh

grade cognitive ability score was 88 and Juanita's seventh grade cognitive ability score was 86.

As the Reading Specialist for the school, I was in and out of many classrooms helping the Language Arts teachers in various ways. While in the Reading class, I noticed Juanita and Ben, especially their negative attitude toward being in the class. I discussed the students with the teacher, and she agreed that both of them would probably benefit from more individualized instruction. I considered some other students with similar characteristics as well, but I was somehow drawn to Juanita and Ben. I decided to talk to them individually first, to see how they would react to participating in the study with me. First, I talked to Ben. During our conversation, he told me that he felt like he really needed help with his reading. He said he didn't like to read, but he knew he needed to read better for high school. When I described the study, he nodded his head, smiled, and said he would like to do it. He said he wanted to talk to his mother about it before I called her, so he could explain it to her himself. The next day, I called Ben's mom, and she was very eager for him to receive extra help in reading. She made an appointment with me to come discuss the study and to sign the consent forms. When she came the next day, the three of us met together in the conference room to discuss the study. I explained the details of how the study would take place and read the permission letter. She and Ben both were very open to the opportunity and were very positive about Ben receiving extra help in reading. They each signed the consent forms and we left the conference room. After Ben went back to class, she made a point to tell me that Ben gets very frustrated when reading, and wanted to know if I was willing to be patient

with him, because in the past some teachers were not very patient with him. I assured her that I really felt that Ben would benefit from the one-to-one work, and that I would be sensitive to his frustrations.

Next, I talked to Juanita about the study. When I first went to get her from Reading class, she looked at me warily. As she came out, I said, "You're not in trouble!" and she looked relieved. As we walked toward the conference room, I said that I wanted to ask her if she could help me with something. After sitting down together in the conference room, I explained the study. When I asked her if she would be willing to participate with me in the reading apprenticeship, she literally lit up. She smiled (the first time I had ever seen her with a big smile). She said she would like to participate, and could we call her mom. So we went to the office and called her mom, and Juanita spoke to her first and told her about it. I took the phone next and explained briefly. She said she would really like for Juanita to get help in reading, and did she need to sign anything. I explained the consent form, and she said she could come up right after school. Juanita met me by the office after school and her mother came in soon. We went to the conference room and I explained everything to both of them. Both Juanita and her mother speak English fluently. The mother asked me how bad Juanita's reading was, and I explained that I hadn't evaluated her reading yet, but that I chose her based on her state test scores and her own indication that she wanted extra help. I assured her that I would share all information with her at the conclusion of the study. She and Juanita each signed the consent forms, and they both said thank-you for giving Juanita some extra help.

I found it interesting that both Ben and Juanita seemed so positive about receiving extra help. Later, I spoke to three sixth and seventh grade students who had similar criteria about participating, because my original plan was to have four students participate, two before school on alternating days and two after school on alternating days. None of the sixth or seventh graders wanted to participate. The seventh grade athletic program is after school, which would have necessitated the before school time slot for the two seventh graders I spoke to. They were not at all interested in getting to school at 7:00 in the morning. My theory is that the eighth graders have a higher level of concern for their reading ability because they know they will be in high school next year. They also know about the policy of the district to not be promoted if they do not pass the state test. This theory proved true with Juanita and Ben as our dialogue progressed.

Due to time constraints in getting started with the reading apprenticeships, I made the decision to discontinue trying to recruit additional participants, and to limit my study to two cases. I felt that this would give me more time on the alternate days to write up journal reflections and view the videotapes to make instructional decisions.

Setting

The reading apprenticeship sessions took place in a little room connected to the school library. The room is designed to be a small instructional space, however it is used also to store some library equipment. It has two entrances, one from the library and one from the outside hall. It has one semicircular table with several chairs. It also has some tables stored along one wall, two empty and one with some overhead projectors

and other materials stored on it, some built-in cabinets along a second wall, three library VCRs and televisions on carts along the third wall, and a dry erase board mounted to the fourth wall which is near to the semicircular table. My office space is in another smaller room a few yards away, also connected to the library. I carried materials back and forth each session.

I decided to videotape every session, understanding that we would all be nervous in front of the camera at first, but would soon get used to it if used consistently. I set up the library video camera on a tripod in one corner of the room, pointing to the table where we would be sitting together. I turned on the tape at the beginning of each session and left it on the entire time. Three sessions fit on each tape, and I labeled each tape with the student's name and the dates of the sessions.

Neither Ben nor Juanita seemed very nervous in front of the video recorder after the first few minutes of the first session. I think I was more nervous than they were, and more aware of it being on even in later sessions, probably because I was viewing the tapes as we went along and watching and listening to myself. Most of the time, though, I forgot it was there as I concentrated more on the interactions we were having and the decisions I was continually making during the sessions.

I liked the room we used because it was private and a nice space, but at the end of the morning sessions it became noisy out in the hall with students waiting for the bell. It was usually pretty quiet after school and during eighth period. During the month of April, I was not able to use the room because the Math Specialist was given it to hold small group math sessions for the state test preparation. She needed it before school to

prepare, and used it eighth period for small groups. So I moved out to a corner of the library. I was worried that it would be too noisy or distracting to be there, but students who came into the library before school stayed quietly toward the center area, and we generally were left alone. It didn't seem to bother either Juanita or Ben to change locations. We returned to our little room when the state test was over.

Instrumentation

Both quantitative and qualitative data were collected during this study. Both students were assessed during the first few sessions using *the Classroom Assessment of Reading Processes (CARP)* (Swearingen & Allen, 1997), which yielded both qualitative and quantitative data.

Classroom Assessment of Reading Processes (CARP)

The *CARP* is an informal reading inventory which offers a qualitative view of a student's reading processes (Swearingen & Allen, 1997). The *CARP* is based on a theoretical framework that is in congruence with the theoretical orientation taken in this study. The design of the *CARP* is one that allows teachers to select all or portions of the assessment to administer. The portions chosen for this study included Word Lists, Narrative Retellings and Expository Retellings, and Miscue Analysis.

The word lists are administered to help determine a level to help facilitate entry into the other sections of the test. On Narrative Retellings, the reader reads the selection either orally or silently. The reader is then asked to retell the story. The retelling allows the teacher to determine whether or not the reader can recall story elements in the appropriate sequence, which provides a measure of comprehension. Protocols are

provided to assist the analysis and determination of independent, instructional, and frustration reading levels.

The Expository Retelling is developed around a K-W-L (Ogle, 1986) format. The student is first asked about prior knowledge of the topic, then asked to retell information gained from the text after reading. Protocols are also provided to determine how the student uses prior knowledge to gain information from text and to determine independent, instructional and frustration reading levels.

Two forms are provided for each grade level on each type of passage, so they can be used for oral and silent reading, and for pre and post testing. Oral reading of either narrative or expository passages can be used to obtain running records for a miscue analysis. Oral and silent readings can also be timed and reading rates can be determined.

These sections of the *CARP* were administered at the beginning of the reading apprenticeship and again at the end, using different reading passages.

State Test Scores

Quantitative data also included state test scores from the previous year which were obtained from student school records at the beginning of the study, and test scores from the current year which were obtained at the end of the study. Also considered were the scores from a school-wide benchmark test given in March, right before the school spring break. The state test is given in late April, so it occurred toward the end of the study. The score reports break down data into objectives, showing the number of questions asked from each objective, the number answered correctly, and whether or not

that objective was mastered.

Additional qualitative data included student interviews and questionnaires, parent questionnaires, teacher questionnaires, videotapes of each session, running records, and reflective journals by the researcher. Five of the sessions from each student were also transcribed for further analysis.

Student Interviews and Questionnaires

Students were asked questions from a prepared questionnaire. At the beginning of the reading apprenticeship, the questions were discussed orally and recorded on the questionnaire by the teacher/researcher, some during the actual interview and some while viewing the videotapes. At the end of the semester, the students were given the second questionnaire and asked to complete it on their own at home. It was hoped that they would put more thought into their answers if allowed to complete it in private. See Appendix B for interview questions.

Parent Questionnaires

At the conclusion of the semester, a questionnaire was sent through the students to their parents. They were completed and the students brought them back to school. See Appendix C for questionnaire.

Teacher Questionnaires

At the conclusion of the semester, a questionnaire was given to each teacher of the students. They were put into their mailbox at school with a cover letter explaining the purpose of the form. They were returned to my mailbox within two weeks. See Appendix D for questionnaire.

Videotapes

Every session was videotaped with the exception of two for one student and one for the other, when the videotape recorder was being used by another teacher. Those sessions were described in the reflective journal more thoroughly as a result. The videotape recorder was set up in a corner of the room on a tripod as unobtrusively as possible. The students were aware it was there and turned on, but after the first few minutes of the first session, it did not seem to bother them or interfere with the sessions. There were twenty-one sessions for one student and twenty-two for the other. As researcher, I took notes in my journal reflection while viewing every session. I also had five sessions transcribed for each student. The transcribed sessions were every fourth session, and were transcribed to allow for more careful analysis. They were chosen to be representative of all sessions and not purposefully, by choosing every fourth session.

Running Records

Running records were taken of segments of reading by each student toward the end of some sessions. Running records allow for miscue analysis to discover patterns of difficulty as well as strengths in strategy use. The books that the students were reading from during the reading apprenticeship were books that they chose themselves from a larger collection of middle grade level (6-8) books that I chose. I brought in a collection of books which included narrative as well as informational books. Ben chose two narrative books during the semester, and Juanita chose two informational books. The particular books they chose will be discussed in the description of each case. See Appendix E for examples of running records.

Reflective Journals

As teacher/researcher, I wrote a reflective journal for every session with each student. Some reflection was written soon after the session, and some reflection was added as I viewed the videotapes of the sessions. A great deal of additional reflection was facilitated by the use of the videotapes. It was possible to see expressions on the faces of students when I was not looking at them during sessions, hear things they said that I missed in real time, and have my memory jogged about things I was thinking about and decisions I was making during the sessions.

Description of Cases

The following section will describe each case in detail. It will follow a chronological sequence, and will describe the events that occurred during each reading apprenticeship session and the instrumentation used during that time. This detailed description follows the recommendations of Merriam (1988) to include "a thorough description of the context of setting within which the inquiry took place..., and a thorough description of the transactions or processes observed in that context" (p. 194). Merriam conveys that these items make up the bulk of thick description.

Case One, Ben

This section describes in detail the events from each session with Ben. It is organized chronologically, to help the reader see the sequence of events that took place in the reading apprenticeship. After the description of case one, Ben, there is a similar description of case two, Juanita. In chapter four, there is an analysis of themes that emerged from the two cases and they are discussed across cases.

Session 1

I had everything ready when Ben came in for the first session of our new reading apprenticeship. He looked around a little nervously, so I suggested a place for him to sit, and I sat down next to him after turning on the video camera. I told him how glad I was that he agreed to help me and that I thought it would be helpful for him, too.

First, we went over my anticipated agenda for the lessons. I had prepared this agenda to be similar to literacy lessons that occur in the Reading Recovery program (Clay, 1993), with familiar reading, working with words, writing, and reading new material. Ben's body language was positive, with nodding of his head, raising eyebrows. He rubbed his eyes a few times, and I hoped that 7 a.m. was not going to be a problem with him.

I introduced him to the questionnaire, and asked if he would like to fill it out on his own silently, or have me read the questions aloud and discuss answers together, which I would record. He chose to do the questionnaire out loud. Ben seemed very comfortable answering the questionnaire. Ben doesn't like to read, but views himself as an "OK" reader. "I can read, but not that well - like you add a word or leave out a word - you have to not do that." He gets frustrated or "aggravated," as he said, when he comes to words he doesn't know and has to pause and figure them out. He would like to be able to read more fluently without having to pause or ask someone what a word is. When Ben comes to words he doesn't know, he said he tries to sound it out, but if he gets aggravated, he skips it. He sometimes uses context clues and in math he asks the teacher. His favorite things to read about are western stories about Indians and

reservations and stories about slavery and racism, civil action, and people like Martin Luther King and Malcolm X.

The final question was "Tell me about what you remember from elementary school reading classes." Ben shared that he had been in five different schools, in five different cities, between first and eighth grade . He remembered sitting in circles and learning how to pronounce words. He said all of the schools were basically the same. He remembered having trouble reading, but he couldn't remember which grade it was. "All the other kids could read really fast and I couldn't."

After completing the questionnaire, I showed Ben the assortment of books I had brought and briefly told him a little about each one. He picked up some of them and flipped through some of the pages. He chose the book *Danger on Midnight River* by Gary Paulsen (1999) to start with. This book is in the Soar to Success series, and is on the sixth grade reading level and sixth to high school interest level. He read the introduction aloud, then I asked him to tell me in his own words what it was about. He retold the introduction:

"I guess a van crashed. And a guy fell in and tried to hold on to the van and he fell in and like he thought he was going to like grab on to something and he had it and all the sudden he just shoved as fast as he could down the river. He probably, he obviously was damaged because they talked about blood trickling and he thought he had been kicked by a mule, and his body was aching and his forehead was throbbing."

Ben then read chapter one. I noticed that when Ben was reading aloud, he would start to finger point each time he started having trouble, then would give it up when he

got back on track. I went back and timed his reading of the introduction from the video. He read 207 words in 2 minutes 25 seconds, which is about 87 words per minute. The first chapter was 1000 words and he read it in 10 minutes 4 seconds, which is about 100 words per minute.

We concluded our session when it was time for Ben to go to first period. I told him thank you and I thought he was going to do really well.

Session 2

We didn't have school on Monday, so this session was one week later. I greeted Ben as he came in and we sat in the same chairs as last session. I showed him the materials for the *CARP* and told him we were going to do some testing to see some things about his reading that could help us. I told him that the test would show his strengths in using strategies so we would know what he could already do well and build on that. Ben was very cooperative with the *CARP*. He scored at the frustration level on the sixth grade word list, but independent on the fifth grade one. I think he was nervous to start, then became more relaxed. Most of the words he missed on the sixth grade list he would try to sound out once or twice, then say "I don't know". He was successful with beginning and ending sounds on most words, but not with the medial sounds. We did two narratives at fifth grade, one orally and one silently. He scored at independent level on comprehension on both of them. We then did a sixth grade narrative orally and he again scored at the independent level.

We ran out of time before doing the expository passages, but planned to do them on another day. More detailed analysis of the *CARP* for Ben will be discussed in

Chapter 4, Results and Findings.

Session 3

I shared the results of Ben's *CARP*. He seemed interested in what I was saying and we talked about his strength being comprehension, and that we would use that strength to work on the things he felt he needed to be a better reader.

We then read from his book for the remainder of the time. I wanted to do this to get him further into the story so we would have something to work from next time. He seemed to enjoy the story and was able to retell sections. He did not read with much expression. At one point, he came to the words "the driver started the engine". He said "the driver started to", shrugged his shoulders and said, "I don't know," then started to continue. I said, "Did that make sense to you?" He said, "No", so I said, "Go back and read it again if it didn't make sense." He read the sentence again, again said "started to" instead of "started the," stopped when he came to "engine" and said more emphatically, "I don't know that word!" So I pointed to the text and said "the driver started the, what would the driver start?" He immediately said, "engine!" I then said, "Think about what the sentence means when you come to a word you don't know."

When he seemed to be getting tired, I asked him if he would like to alternate reading pages or chapters. He wanted me to read a chapter, so I did to model for him. I asked him to look at the words while I read, and I modeled expressive reading.

His turn came for chapter three. This time he self-corrected: "The current had slowed the lodge, a lodge, the van..Huh? The current had slowed and lunged, no, lodged the van on some boulders..." Ben nodded as the sentence became clear to him. As the

action became more exciting in the story, Ben's reading became faster and more expressive. He also sat up straighter in his chair. At the end of that chapter, we talked about how exciting it was.

I read the next chapter and modeled "thinking aloud" as I had questions or thoughts about the story. Ben didn't look at the words on the page at first, but as the action got exciting again, he did. We talked about hypothermia and camping and what was happening in the story. He read part of the next chapter before it was time to stop.

The next day, I visited one of the elementary schools in the district to observe some Reading Recovery lessons. I wrote in my journal:

"Some strategies I would like to incorporate with Ben include: focus on balancing the three cueing systems - meaning, structure, and visual - to help with fluency. Ben's strength is meaning, so if he could rely on it a little more instead of getting hung up with visual, that might help. He does need to pay attention to the visual cues of the middle of the word, though. The strategy of chunking and syllabication of the word will probably help him. I need to bring the dry erase markers in the room and use them to write out the troublesome words on the table to break down like they did in Reading Recovery. I think he would respond well to that strategy."

Session 4

I got another copy of the book, so I wouldn't have to look over Ben's shoulder when he reads and he could look on his own copy when I read. I commented again to Ben the fact that his strength is gaining meaning from the text. Even when he reads

slowly and has many miscues, he is able to retell the story and talk about the story. I suggested that he use that strength to help him when he comes to a word he doesn't know. "When you come to a word you don't know, consciously think to yourself, 'what word would go there? What makes sense there?' ... that helps you to figure it out. Look at the beginning of the word to help you, too. Try that today when you come to words you don't know." I gave the example of the word *engine* from the last session.

We continued on chapter 5. He read portions really fast and with expression, then slowed down to word-by-word when he had difficulty. I suggested at one miscue that he read the rest of the sentence and use meaning to figure out the word (*poured*). He did it, and was successful. When we finished the chapter, we went back and talked about the words he had trouble with: *generous*, *cache*, and *ought*. We got out the dry erase markers and wrote *ought* on the table. He said, "cool"! I let him write some. We did *ought*, *tough*, and *though*, and talked about the irregularities.

Next, we talked about Ben writing about something from the book or something totally different. I asked him if he would like to write on some of the topics he had to do for English, or for the state test practice. He sort of groaned, so I said, "Do you not like to write?" He said, "Not really." I explained about how writing could help his reading and reading would help his writing, so I would like for us to practice both. He seemed very reluctant. I said we would talk about it again later.

Session 5

We started on chapter 6. I thought he might prefer to get through the book before going back and rereading any, even though I had said we would do familiar

reading. He read chapter 6. I read chapter 7 to Ben. I commented to him about the writing style on p. 36 about the skunk and the fact that the author was descriptive and "showed, not told". Ben read chapter 8. After we were through reading, I asked Ben to make a prediction. He predicted that they would be found. I pointed out to Ben the good strategy he used in figuring out words. He told himself to "go back, go back," when he got confused. He also remembered to finish the sentence when he came to the word *parallel* that he didn't know and tried to figure out what should go there.

We finished by talking again about what kind of writing we could do. We talked about the writing he is doing in his English class. I suggested that he write about the characters in the book so he could get straight which characters had which traits. He wrote on my yellow pad, which I later put into his spiral. We discussed the various characters and he commented about what he was writing.

Session 6

Ben brought his autobiography he is writing for English class to show to me. We started on chapter 9 of the book. He asked me if we wanted to do a page and a page alternating, or a chapter and a chapter. I said, "whatever you like." He said "lets do a page and a page this time." He started reading. He stopped when he got confused and said, "Huh?" I said, "That didn't make sense, did it?" He was confused about the contraction *how're*. He also questioned the word *john* and why it wasn't capitalized. I explained that it was being used as a word for bathroom, so it wasn't a proper name. When Ben read page 46, he got confused about when the character Daniel showed up. He stopped and asked "Daniel is there?" I explained that on the page before, Daniel had

found the other boys, and showed Ben on the page where that occurred. We laughed about being confused, because I was confused at that point, too. When he realized it was Daniel, he said, "I thought, that wasn't like them", speaking of the other characters not acting like Daniel by helping save Troy. After page 46, Ben kept reading on to page 47 himself, so I didn't stop him. Half-way through the page, he commented on the character having a broken leg, and we talked about how it must have hurt. The story was very descriptive at that part. I asked Ben if he wanted me to finish that page, and he said, "No, I'll do it". He seemed eager to get on with the story! On page 51, he repeated the first sentence after having trouble with *makeshift*. On the third sentence, he stopped and said, "no" when he said *something* instead of *using*. On page 53, I wondered out loud why Daniel didn't want the dog to come over to them. Ben talked about it may be a wolf or a wolverine. He talked about that for a few seconds. When he read the part about the dog having white foam, Ben stopped immediately and said, "Oh, rabies!" When Ben finished the chapter, he said, " but it was nighttime when they saw the skunk" I said, "It was?" He said, "Remember, they were looking for a place to sleep." Actually, on page 35, the boys were looking for a place to get out of the approaching rainstorm when they ran into the skunk. I didn't remember, either, though! On page 56 Ben stopped and commented about why the boys were taking Troy off the stretcher instead of carrying him across the river in it. We talked it out. Ben made a prediction about the river being too deep to get across easily. His prediction was right, and I commented to that effect when it happened in the story. Ben was anxious to read the last chapter. He skipped a page on 62 and immediately knew he had done that when it

didn't make sense.

At the end of the book, Ben talked about a time when he went camping. Ben wanted to write on the table with the dry erase marker. I asked him if he struggled with any of the words, and he said *bough*. He wrote *bough, ought, thought, throughout, and cough*. He made the connection that *laugh* was similar. I gave him his spiral and he wrote, "Ben's Book" in it when I asked him to write his name on it. Ben seemed to be in a really good mood today, compared to other times. He was more responsive, more friendly, humorous, and eager.

Session 7

After viewing the first tapes, I went back and made a list of words Ben had trouble with in the book. I wrote them in the back of his spiral. I also decided to do a *CARP* expository text with him. We did the electric eel passage, which is fifth grade level. I asked him what he already knew about electric eels, then asked him to read the passage silently. He had some prior knowledge about electric eels, but not concerning anything that was in the passage. He retold 75% of the passage, which is Instructional level. We then did the tornado passage, which is 6th grade level. He knew that a tornado was a type of storm and it twisted around, but he didn't know how fast or how it compared to a hurricane. He retold 69% of the passage, which is frustration level.

After the *CARP*, I acknowledged that Ben had asked to read *There's a Wolf in the Classroom* by Weide and Tucker (1999) next. (He saw me in the library a few days before and asked what we would read next since we finished the first book. I said we needed to think about it and decide. He said we could read the wolf book, so I said OK,

that sounded good). I suggested we reread some familiar reading from the first book before we got started on the wolf book. I asked him to chose one chapter from the book to read and he chose chapter 2. That was actually the chapter I read the first time through. He read chapter 2 (498 words, 5:09) at 97 words per minute.

I then asked Ben to do some writing before we started the new book. I asked him to write a paragraph for Daniel to persuade the other boys to go back across the river. (I wanted to see if he could write a paragraph with one reason elaborated like he will have to do on the state test). Ben seemed very hesitant to do this activity. He reluctantly made a list of reasons. He required quite a lot of prompting on my part to write anything. He ended up with a moderately elaborated paragraph. After he was finished, I commented, "It seemed that you didn't like doing that. Do you not like to write? Or were you just not up to it today?" He smiled and stretched and said, "I don't like to write." We talked about that for a minute.

We finished the session by starting the first part of the wolf book. We looked through the pictures and talked about what the book would be about, then he read until it was time to go.

Session 8

Ben was absent the day scheduled for our next session, and we had a school holiday also, so this session was over one week later. Ben brought an unfinished essay from his English class he wanted to finish. Since he does not usually want to write, I decided to start right away with this activity. We talked about the purpose and form of writing (persuasive essay). He verbalized as he wrote and seemed eager to write a good

essay. He wasn't nearly as reluctant to write as last session. I think that was due to it a school assignment that he needed to turn in, so he felt like he could get some help from me. He wrote with very little prompting on my part.

He talked through his thoughts several times. He was searching for a word to describe the type of comedy "The Simpsons" television show is. He came up with *mature*. He talked through the spelling of *their* as a possessive. He got stuck a little on elaborating his paragraph about the humor. We talked it out and he began to have some ideas. He used a scratch sheet to work through the spelling of some words. Several times he asked questions about spelling, but also about whether an idea was a good one. ("Could I say...."). He talked about an idea before putting it on paper. We talked about transitions between paragraphs. I encouraged Ben in his ability to come up with ideas for paragraphs and to stick to each idea and elaborate it throughout the paragraph. He wrote consistently for the entire session.

Session 9

Ben was absent from school for one week and the next week was the state test for writing, so this session was two weeks later. While Ben was absent, I took time to look through the library for books he might be interested in. Because of his interest in sports and also in racial issues, I noticed the book *Danger Zone* by David Klass (1996). I went to the bookstore and purchased a copy in paperback and brought it to this session. I showed it to Ben and told him a little about it, then asked if he thought it might be a book he would like to read. He looked through it, and said he thought it looked good.

I also brought in a electronic speller for him to type in his word list. I showed him how it worked, then he typed in the words. He seemed to enjoy doing this. I suggested going back to the first book for familiar reading, and Ben commented that the book wasn't as good as he first thought it would be. I asked him if he thought it was because it was so short that it didn't have room for elaboration. He agreed. I asked him if he would rather go ahead and start the new book, and he said yes.

I suggested that he read the back of the cover first, to give him an overview of the story. When he got to the word *tough*, he hesitated, then all of a sudden said, "That's one of our words!" I said, "It is!", then he repeated "how...tough". He nodded confidently when he said it! When he finished, he asked, "So he's white and the rest of the team is black?" He then asked if we wanted to alternate pages, so I said "Why don't you read until you get tired, then I'll read some. He said, OK. We stopped to talk about what a *zone* is. He struggled with pronouncing *mediocre*. He knew it had to be something that meant "not hot", but he couldn't figure it out, so I supplied the word. He recognized it then, and went on. Decoding *consistency* also gave him trouble. He tried covering up part of the word, but soon gave up. I suggested that he go back and read the sentence again. He said, "I understand the sentence, but I don't know that word." He read the sentence again, and I supplied the word. He repeated it, nodding. I felt like Ben was feeling frustrated with his trouble decoding. He said he was tired of reading after page 3, so I picked up on page 4 and read through page 6. As I read, I made comments about the story. I asked him what it meant by an NBA 3 pointer, because I really didn't know! He explained it to me, and seemed pleased that he knew. I read so much myself

because I could tell Ben was tired, and I felt it important to read as far as we could to get into the story so he would read and hear enough to become interested in the story.

Session 10

There was no video camera available for this session, because it was being used by another teacher for the day. Ben was right on time. He picked up the electronic speller, so I suggested that he read the word list and add some new ones. He read his words, then added *mediocre* and *consistency* from last session. He looked through the menu and manipulated the various functions to see what else it would do. He got to the dictionary function, so I showed him how to get to check the meanings of his words.

Next, he picked up his book, so I asked him if he remembered what had happened so far in the story. He then retold details from the first part of chapter one that we read last time. He remembered the events in sequence and told it accurately. We alternated reading a few pages each. He was using the pen as a marker, so I offered him an envelope to use, thinking I would bring an index card next time. He still self-corrected some, but still would miscue and go on without correcting.

As I read, I pointed out some descriptive writing and made some comments about liking the descriptive phrases about the snow. When he read "picked the pocket" he stopped, turned to me, and explained that that meant he stole the ball. I felt like Ben was really enjoying the story. Our conversations were very natural as we commented on what was happening in the story while we read.

As our time came to a close, Ben commented that he liked this book better because it was "juicier". I said, "because it is longer and has more room for meatier

description?" He said, "Yeah, the chapters are longer, like you said, "meatier." I thought to myself, "Yeah, he's hooked!"

Session 11

Ben seemed really tired or in a bad mood when he came in. He was very reluctant. I got out the electronic speller and asked if he wanted to go through the words he had put in. He read them quietly. When he got to *mediocre*, he said, "that's the only one I don't know". I said the word, and he repeated it.

We got out *Danger Zone* and I suggested that we alternate pages since he was tired. He responded with a very slight nod, so I suggested that I start out and finish the last page of chapter two and he could start on chapter 3. I retold the end of chapter 2 before I started reading. I commented about why the character James didn't feel he could go on the tour, because it would be a busy time for his mom in the store. Ben nodded. I finished chapter 2, then handed the book to Ben. I offered him an index card to use as a place card. He took it and used it, but I felt like it was getting in his way. When he got to the second paragraph, he laughed about the humor in the line, and I thought, "A response!"

He read really slowly. He worked on decoding *gracious* on his own. When he came to "analyze the strengths and weaknesses", he said *amazed* instead of *analyze*. I asked him if that made sense and he looked back and immediately said *analyze*. We alternated reading one page at a time. On starting one of his pages, he said, "no thanks" to the index card. I was glad, because I felt like it was restricting his view and making him read more slowly.

He showed his frustration when trying to decode the word *analytical*. He said, "there are too many big words". I said, "You're doing great". He said, "I don't know the word!" I supplied the word, since he seemed frustrated. He again got frustrated with the word *accusations*. I suggested that he try sounding it out. He said, "I just did!" He tried it again, and I prompted him with part of the word and he got it. When he got to "inventing an excuse", he said, "inviting an ex -kiss". I asked him if it was *inviting*, and he corrected it to *inventing*, then said, "I don't know that word" I said, "that was right, inventing." He said, "No, I don't know the e word and I sounded it out." I said excuse, and said, "inventing an excuse." I said, "Does that make sense, now?" He said, "Now, yes." When I looked back at the videotape from this session, I thought to myself, "Why did I just keep giving him the words instead of suggesting strategies?" I think I recognized his frustration and was afraid to frustrate him further by having him work strategically, but I don't think it was effective to do that.

I started getting confused with the story line on a page that I was reading, so I modeled thinking aloud about my confusion. Ben just sat there, looking bored. The plot became clearer to me on the next page, so I expressed my understanding out loud to him.

The word *tough* was on the next page that he read, and he read it without hesitation. He read through without making any comments about the story.

The last 5 minutes, I asked Ben to read a practice passage from the state reading test. I suggested that he read the questions first. I read them out loud to him. We decided to do just the first 3 questions, since we didn't have much time left. I read the title, and

said that sometimes the title has some important clues in it. When we got to the questions, he answered each one correctly, and told me how he got each answer.

Session 12

The state test practice test was Wednesday, the tenth, then spring break was last week, so this session was two weeks later. Ben started out by reading his words from the electronic speller and writing some of them on the table with the dry erase markers. When he got to *cache*, I asked him if he remembered what that word meant. He said, "Yeah, I remember how they used it in the story, he had like a cache of leaves or berries." When he got to *ought*, *rough*, *tough*, and *taught*, he said, "I didn't know how often I actually use these words. Like the *taught* and the *thought*, I never noticed it, and I use them a lot. Like in writing, I use them a lot writing to people or just writing for fun, I never noticed that I used them as much as I did." We kept talking about the different forms of the words and how they worked.

I asked Ben how he felt he was doing in our sessions, now that we are halfway through. He said, "The reading has helped me read better, but I'm just worried about [state test], really worried about [state test]." He said he got only halfway through with the school practice test before spring break. He said he gave up and started guessing after about halfway through. They have been talking about it in his English class, and he is really worried about it. I told him we could work on it in here, too. Between now and the test in April, we could work on some passages and test-taking techniques that will help him.

I suggested that Ben begin reading in *Danger Zone* and to think back at what

happened in the last chapter since it's been so long since he read it. I told him that we could alternate reading. He asked if we wanted to alternate pages or paragraphs, and I said whatever was comfortable for him. He said, "Let's do a page and a page." I asked him if he wanted to just start over with that chapter, and he said we might as well since it's been a week and then he looked at me and said, "We're rereading!" When he got started, he stopped and said, "Oh yeah, I remember this part!" and started telling me what happened in that part of the story. He continued reading, and I let him work out his miscues without interruption. He made a few comments about the content of the story as he read. Once, he skipped a line and as he read the next line, he looked up at me and said, "Is that right?" I said, "Did it make sense? I think you skipped a line." So he went back and corrected it.

The story described one character as looking like Jack Nicholas, and Ben didn't know who that was. I explained that he was a golfer, that tall, blonde guy. He said, "Oh yeah." He stopped when it was talking about the hard part of being a doctor, telling families when their loved one died. Ben commented at length about how hard that would be. He had trouble decoding *occasionally*, and I said it for him, then said did that make sense? He kept going.

At the end of that page, he asked me to read. I read a page, then Ben started reading again. When he got to the next page, I started to reach for the book, and he said, "I'll still read." So I let him continue. He finished that chapter. Ben seems to be reading much more expressively now, but he still miscues a lot. He self-corrects without as much frustration. He still reads rather choppy, unless he gets into the story, when he

reads much more fluently. He was in a good mood today, which seems to allow him to be much more conversational and willing to use reading strategies without getting frustrated as easily.

Session 13

Ben was absent last Wednesday, so this session was one week later. I brought some state test passages and also the report from the practice test that the English teachers filled out. It showed each objective and how many the student got right from each one. Ben got all of the word meaning questions right. On supporting details, he got 3 out of 4 right. We looked over the one he missed, and I modeled how to find the answer. He sat there and listened quietly. The third objective was main idea and summarizing. He got 2 out of 8, and needs to get 6 out of 8. I said this is a problem area. The next one is relationships among ideas, and he got 4 out of 8, and needs 6 out of 8. Inferences and drawing conclusions has 16 questions and he got 5 right. You need 13 right to pass that objective. Ben wanted to know what happens if you fail one objective. I told him it doesn't necessarily mean you fail the whole test. On the last objective, author's meaning and purpose, fact and opinion, he got 5 out of 8 and needs 6. I explained that they also go by the total correct, not just each objective.

I asked Ben what he thought would be the most helpful for him to work on this, going back to the practice test and looking at all of the ones he missed, working them out, or to just start over with new passages and work through them. He said he would rather do new ones.

I got out one of my laminated passages and dry erase markers that can be used

as a highlighter. I showed him how they work, then gave him the passage to read. I suggested that he read the questions first, read the title, highlight key words in the questions, then read the passage without answering any questions until finished reading. I told him he could read the passage silently, then asked, "Would you rather read it out loud? Do you think you understand it better if you read silently or out loud?" He said, "I like reading out loud better than silently, but I can't read out loud during state test." I said, "Actually, we can set it up where you can. We can put you in a small group room where you can whisper-read out loud quietly." He said, "I'd like that a lot better because I think I read better aloud and that way I won't get as bored during the test and start not fully reading it." I told him I would arrange that with the counselor who is in charge of setting up the testing groups. I also asked Ben if he thought it would be distracting if we had like four kids in the room if they were in each corner in study carrels, and he said no, it would be OK as long as they didn't read too loud. I suggested that we get together the ones that want to do that and test it one afternoon to make sure it would be comfortable for them.

I suggested he do this passage like he would do it that day, to try out the techniques. He read the passage quietly. He picked up the highlighter and highlighted several times during the passage. When he started the questions, he went back to the passage for each one and reread the parts he needed to answer. As he picked the answers, I would ask, "OK, tell me why you picked that, where's your evidence?" He would show me in the passage where he located the evidence for his answer. When he had picked the incorrect answer, I guided him to the passage for the evidence, and asked

him questions to guide him to the correct answer. I modeled the thinking and reasoning that happens in picking the correct answer. I showed him how to examine each answer choice and eliminate them one at a time, rather than just picking one. He was choosing answers too fast, not thinking through each one. Without guidance on this passage, Ben would have missed all of the answers except two. At the end, we reviewed his strategies. We said he would read it out loud and on each question he would consider each answer.

Session 14

I let Ben know that I checked with the counselors and teachers and they approved his testing in the small group with a few other students. I assured him that we would test it ahead of time to make sure it would be comfortable.

I brought out another laminated passage and reminded Ben to read the questions first and to highlight important phrases in the questions and passage. He read it quietly and highlighted parts as he went. While he did the questions out loud, I asked him how he got his answers, so he showed me in the passage where the evidence was. On the opinion question, he was able to eliminate the fact statements, and then look for the opinion question in the passage. He used the two step process I explained to him last time. He read every answer choice this time, without my prompting, and considered each one. He started telling me the evidence and reasons why he chose the answers without my asking after the first two. He thought aloud while working out the inferencing question, telling me what he was thinking about as he considered parts of the passage as evidence. We really had to talk through that question because it was a

difficult one. He reasoned it out as we talked through it, and was finally successful in choosing it. After he finished, I gave him the continuity tester to check his answers. He got them all, and was very proud. I encouraged him to take the time to work them out like that, and that he can do it. His thought processes and reasoning are good, and I told him so. I encouraged him to not give up, and to keep working on them and he will be able to do it.

We talked about the fact that it is also hard to do six or seven passages in a row. We talked about taking mental breaks between each passage to take him away from it for a few minutes. I asked Ben if he wanted to read from his book or try another state test passage, and he chose to do another state test passage. That surprised me, but I think he felt very successful finally on the last one and wanted to see if he could do it again. He read it quietly, then did the questions. He again told me as he went along how he was getting his answers. On the third question, a main idea one, I reminded him to ask himself, "Is that what the whole thing is about?" He had a very hard time getting that one. He picked the wrong answer, but when he finished the rest of the questions, he said, that one might be C. When he checked the answers, he went to C before the one he marked, and it was right. I encouraged him to go back and check when he felt like an answer might not be right, because it was OK to go back and double check the answers. He got all of the rest of them right! He loved seeing that light light up!

Session 15

We didn't have school on Monday because of Easter, so I had asked Ben if he could come on Tuesday and Wednesday to still get two days, but he forgot and just

came on Wednesday. We moved into the library location because of the little room being used for Math tutorials. We talked again about the state test and I showed him the chart from the internet TEA page which shows how many questions you have to get right to equal each score. I wanted to point out to him that even though he made a 58 last year, he only needed seven more questions right to have a passing score. Sometimes the students feel like there's no hope to pass when their score is in the 50's or below, not realizing that 58 is not that far from passing. He seemed pleased that he could miss around fifteen questions and still pass. I wanted to take off some of the pressure and help him feel more relaxed about the test.

I showed Ben another state test passage that was in the format of an advertisement rather than a narrative or informational text. There are usually several on the test like this. He immediately went to the questions and read them first softly, highlighting key words. He started reading the advertisement and highlighted key words confidently. He seems much more confident, like he's getting used to doing these. I pointed out that he was using a good strategy while reading this of comparing information given while reading. He recognized the opinions in the fact question and crossed them out. I reminded him to check both facts to see which one was in the passage. He finished the questions correctly, then we reviewed the strategies he used. I told him I knew he could pass, and that if he used all of his strategies, he would really do well. I don't think he was as sure as I was, but I encouraged him again to take his time and read all of the passages, and to not give up.

I asked Ben if he wanted to read in his book or to start with the words in the

electronic speller. He said he just wanted to start reading. He found his place in the book, then started. He picked up the index card that was the bookmark and started using it as a place marker. After a few sentences, he said, "Oh yeah, I remember this." and started telling me about what was happening. Then he said, "Because we reread this chapter, remember?" Then he told a little more, then started reading again. He seemed to read more fluently today. He miscued some, but self-corrected and reread when he needed to. He also was a little distracted by the movement in the library, but went right back to reading. I asked him if he knew what an abyss was when we came to that word, and he said sort of, but he wasn't sure. We talked about the word for a few minutes, then time was up.

Session 16

Ben was really sleepy that morning. I asked him if he would like to start with a state test passage or read in his book, and he chose to read. I asked him if he would like to read the words from the electronic speller first, and he said yes. He turned it on and read them silently. I asked him if he got them all, and he said yeah. He started the new chapter. He read very monotone at first, but more expressively as he got into the story. We laughed together at a few funny parts. He read a lot before he asked me to read. The part I read was about flying on an airplane, so I asked Ben if he had ever flown. He told me about his plans to fly to several states during this summer to visit relatives. He listened with interest as I read. I commented several times to model thinking aloud as I read. At the end of the chapter, I asked Ben about what he thought was going to happen next. We talked about foreshadowing and how the author used it to prepare us as

readers for the next chapter.

After we finished, we got out a state test passage which was another one that looked like an advertisement. Ben read the questions, then read the passage aloud. He talked through the questions. There was quite a lot of talking going on in the library at this point, because it was close to the bell, but Ben was attending to his state test passage without looking up or seeming distracted this time. I did very little prompting on this passage. Ben practiced thinking aloud through the entire passage. I commented when he finished about how well he was using his strategies.

Session 17

Ben was not at school on Wednesday, so this session was one week later. The state test was this week, so this was our only session. Ben looked really tired again that morning. We talked for a few minutes about how the week of testing would go. I tried to engage him in a little conversation to help him wake up! I gave him a choice of state test passages to work, and he asked if he could do two of them, both the flyer advertisement type.

Ben read the flyer information aloud. He had trouble with *alphabetical*, and I prompted him to finish reading the sentence to figure it out. The next word was *order*, so when he started over and read past the word, he immediately went back and said *alphabetical*. When he finished the passage, I reminded him to use the meaning of the word to help him with words he has trouble with. I also suggested that on the test, if he comes to unfamiliar words, to not get bogged down with them, but to keep reading. Only if the word is important to helping him answer a question would he need to go

back and work it out.

He went through all of the questions aloud, saying what he was thinking about each answer choice. I didn't have to prompt him very much at all. Twice, Ben looked up and said "Right?" to me when he would choose an answer or make a comment. At one point I said that on the test there would be no one for him to ask that, so he could ask himself and verify his own answer by going back to the passage and finding the evidence.

Ben did the second passage the same way. There was one question that asked for information from a particular section with a title, so I suggested that a strategy might be to go ahead and look at the passage and circle or highlight that section so it would be easy to find later. We also talked about the danger of highlighting too much and defeating the purpose of highlighting. He asked if he should highlight a whole paragraph that was asked about in the question, so I said no, wait until he read it and just highlight important points rather than the whole thing. Even when it was almost time to go, Ben stuck with it and answered all of the questions. After he finished, I encouraged him to stick with it on the real test and not give up. I told him I knew he could pass if he continued to use the strategies he has learned. I gave him a baggie of highlighters, stickers, eraser, and an encouraging note, and he said thanks.

Session 18

I was absent for two days last week, and I had meetings out of the building in the district the next week, so this was two weeks after the state test on Wednesday morning. Ben saw my *Animalia* book by Graeme Base (1987) on my shelf, and asked if

he could see it. "I love that book!" So I let him bring it in to our session. We relocated back to the little room again since state test tutorials were over. We looked through the *Animalia* book trying to figure out the words that started with *K*. We are also having a book fair this week, and Ben and I spent one whole morning out at the book fair tables browsing through the books instead of having a session. Ben pointed out a number of books he had read, and commented on how much he liked several of them. I said that I thought he liked reading much more than he had indicated to me! He said that he liked reading when it was a good book. I told him to pick out a book and I would buy it for him to thank him for helping me with my study. He was very excited, and later said he couldn't decide. I said he didn't have to decide today, but to keep looking through until he found one he wanted. Later, he picked out *Nightjohn* by Gary Paulsen (1993). I told him that was great, because it was the same author as *Danger on Midnight River*. He said that he had read the book before and really liked it.

After we put *Animalia* aside, we talked for a few minutes about our last few sessions and that we would be testing again with the *CARP*. We also talked about the fact that we would probably not have time to finish *Danger Zone*, and Ben suggested that we just skip to the last chapter. I told him we would probably miss the most exciting part if we did that. He said that most books start out slow, then get more exciting. He said that's probably why he doesn't like to read because he gets bored in the slow part and never gets to the exciting part. I told him I like books that start out exciting, too, and that don't take too long to build up.

I talked to Ben about the strategies that we have been using. I named the

strategies to him and shared with him how he has been doing them. I explained the think aloud and pointed out when he and I have both used it. I suggested that he could do that when he is reading for his classes when it gets confusing.

I asked him what strategies he has learned to help him when he comes to words he doesn't know. He said, "Context clues, breaking it down, trying it over again." I reminded him that he has been paying attention to the middle of the word much better. I also suggested that meaning is his strength, so his best strategy is to use the meaning, or context clues, to help him figure it out. I complimented him on not giving up on words. I rarely see him just stop and say, "I don't know that word" anymore like he did at the beginning, but he tries to figure it out.

Ben picked up *Danger Zone* and said "He is flying and getting to the airport." I was surprised since it had been so long that he remembered so well. He started reading and came to *cruise*. I said, "I think you'll do better to use the meaning, so go ahead and finish the sentence. He did, and left a blank where the word was, then said "cruise?" He nodded confidently when I said yes. As he read, we both commented when we remembered parts from earlier in the book that related to what he was reading. Ben read pretty fluently. He miscued, but self-corrected, and it didn't seem to interrupt his flow or make him feel frustrated at all. He read and read, and finally handed me the book. I read the rest of the chapter, and Ben paid close attention, looking at the book with me. I got confused at one point in the chapter, so I said, "That confuses me," and Ben turned back the page and showed me the part it was referring to that clarified it. So I knew he was following the story closely. At the end of the chapter, I said, "Uh, Oh, I predict trouble!"

as the chapter ended with a conflict between two of the basketball team members. Ben said, "Yeah, they probably both are competing for the same position on the team."

Session 19

I brought in the tape from the last session to show Ben. I wanted to let him hear himself read from *Danger Zone* and then reread the passage. He watched the tape as far as one page of reading. I suggested that he look along in the book, but he wanted to watch the tape. We turned off the tape, and I asked him what he thought. He just shrugged his shoulders and said he didn't know. He read the page again. I noticed he was trying to read with more expression. I then took the current tape out and showed it to him. I put it back in and he read it a third time. I asked him to read it like he was reading it in front of a whole class, with lots of expression. He read it very fluently this time, with much more expression. I noticed again that Ben goes, "blah" when he feels like he really gets tongue-tied. Juanita does the same thing. Maybe that's a middle school thing!

After I turned off the tape, I asked Ben if he wanted to start the next chapter in *Danger Zone*. He said, "Or we could read a chapter in *Nightjohn*." I said that would be fine. So he closed *Danger Zone*, but started talking about the picture on the front of the book. He identified which character he thought each of the pictures was. He then put it down and picked up *Nightjohn*. He began reading. He had a little trouble at first with the dialect, and I commented that dialect is sometimes hard to read at first. He got used to it in a few minutes. After he finished the chapter, I asked him what else happens in the story, and he told me a little bit about it. I commented that it is nice to go back to

books you have read before, because you get different things from them each time you read.

Session 20

We did the posttest of the *CARP* at this session. I had the word list sitting on the table, and he started reading them right away. I had to stop him to explain the directions! I told him I was excited that he was so anxious to do them. As he read each list, he wanted to know how many he got right. So we discussed each list as he completed it. He wanted to know what some of the words meant, so we talked about them. He spent several seconds on some of them, trying to decode them and recognize the word, but only said, "I don't know" once. Even on that one, he continued trying after saying it and finally got the word. On *delicious* he spent 19 seconds decoding it and on *devastation* he spent 44 seconds. When he said *tsunami* correctly, he looked at me and said, "right?" I said uh huh, and he said, "Yes!!" Most of the rest he got within 5 to 10 seconds. He scored independent on the fifth and seventh grade lists, and instructional on the sixth, eighth, and ninth grade. He was hesitant to read the ninth grade list when he saw it, so I said to just look over it and say the words he knew. He randomly said a few of them, then started at the top and tried all of them. He got seventeen out of twenty words, but it did take him several seconds to do some of them. He said, "so I'm at the ninth grade level?" I said, "Yes, but I wouldn't say fluent at that level, but you can read them with work." I commented on how much more persistent he was this time to stick with it and figure them out without giving up. I told him the more he did that the easier it would be and it wouldn't take as long. I said he was instructional at the ninth grade

level with some support. He motioned with his arm and said, "Yes!" He was so pleased to have progressed! I commented that when he works with ninth grade materials next year, these are the types of words that he will encounter in the books. I said, "Don't be afraid to get help and work through your materials without giving up." He said, "Yes! I passed state test and went up four grades!" He didn't really go up that many, but I didn't correct him because he was so excited and was feeling so successful.

Next, I asked him to read the seventh grade narrative story out loud. He read very quickly, 123 words per minute, and had only minor miscues, which he mostly self-corrected. Ben retold the story with 100% accuracy.

The next passage was the seventh grade expository text, which was about tsunamis. Ben had some prior knowledge about the topic, knowing that it was a bad storm and a big wave, but he said that was all he knew about them. He read the passage aloud. He read much more slowly, 78 words per minute. He scored 75% on retelling, which is at the instructional level. He remembered more from the end of the passage, but couldn't recall some facts from the beginning.

Session 21

Ben started out teasing that he had already done all of the reading passages and was on the ninth grade level. I had asked him if he wanted to come in during fourth period today, because his reading teacher said he could, but he had decided to stay in class with his friends. When he came in for library aide period five, he said he wanted to go ahead and come in with me. He said he wished he had come with me after all during fourth, because he had to look up twenty words in the dictionary during reading

class!

Ben read the eighth grade expository passage out loud. This passage was about fingerprints, and he had prior knowledge that fingerprints are used to identify people. He had a few minor miscues which he self-corrected. When he came to a long name, he said "whatever" instead of the name. When he finished the passage, he said, "I need to figure out that name." I helped him decode it. It was Alphonse Bertillon, and he said, "the Fonz!" He also stopped when the passage was talking about not being able to change fingerprints and started wondering, "What if you cut them off? What if you realign them with a knife?" We talked about it for about a minute, then he resumed reading. He read the passage at 91 words per minute. He retold the passage and recalled all of the details on the protocol except one. This scored at the 89%, which is high instructional.

I asked Ben to read the eighth grade narrative passage silently, but he didn't want to. He said, "Uh Uh, No, I'm not good." I read the purpose setting statement to him, then he started reading out loud. He read at 99 words per minute and had minor miscues. He pronounced *debris* and *devastation* correctly, which were words he missed on the word list. He still did not pronounce *bedraggled* or *amiable* correctly, which were also on the word list. Ben retold the story in great detail, recalling with 100% accuracy. He embellished the story beyond the text appropriately.

I asked Ben if he wanted to do the ninth grade passage, but he said no, he was too tired. I complimented him for how well he worked on this reading inventory, and that he had really come far since the beginning of the semester.

I asked him how he felt about what we have done this semester. He said it was fun. He said his mother had filled out the questionnaire, but he forgot to bring it. He said he hadn't filled out his yet. I asked him to spend some time with it, and to answer as thoroughly as he could.

Case Two, Juanita

This section describes in detail the events from each session with Juanita. It is organized chronologically, to help the reader see the sequence of events that took place in the reading apprenticeship. In chapter four, there is an analysis of the research questions that emerged from the two cases and they are discussed across cases for each question.

Session 1

When Juanita came in, I had everything ready and turned on the camera. I explained to her how the sessions would be and encouraged her to come in straight after school. She forgot to come the first week, so I found her during eighth period and reminded her to come. I showed her the questionnaire and asked her if she would rather fill it out herself, or have me read the questions out loud and talk about them. She chose for us to do it out loud. She was nervous in front of the video camera at first, but soon forgot it was there. She answered the questions with no reserve and seemed to enjoy talking with me.

Juanita said that good readers know big words, they know how to pronounce words, and they're always reading. She did not think she was a good reader at all,

because she said she couldn't say the words right out loud. She said she got very nervous reading out loud, but she didn't mind reading silently. When she comes to a word she doesn't know, Juanita said that she sounds it out to pronounce it. I asked her if she thought about the meaning of the word to help her, and she said no, just sound it out. She said she would like to be able to read out loud better to other people, not just for herself. She would like to read better so she could stop asking people, "What's this word mean, or how do you say this word?" She said she doesn't like people to have to help her out. Juanita said she likes mysteries and horror stories as well as romantic stories. When I asked her if she liked informational books, she said it depended on what it was about. When asked how she felt when someone asked her to read out loud, she said, "I don't really like it because I get nervous. I can't read, so I say, 'I don't want to read.'"

I asked Juanita what she would change about school if she could. She said that the worksheets were too hard. "If I don't do it my way, I don't do it at all. If they give me something I can't understand, then why read it anyway? If I know I'm not going to understand it, why read it at all?"

The last question asked what she remembered from elementary school. Juanita related that she has gone to six different schools from Kindergarten through eighth grade. She and Ben have this in common. She moved in and out of this district three times, twice to an out of state location. She has been at this school since the last month of sixth grade. Juanita remembered teachers teaching her to separate the words, then sound all the words out, then put it all together. She said she thought she read OK until about

third or fourth grade. Then she remembered a boy making fun of her reading out loud. "This boy started making fun of me when I read out loud. I started crying and told my mom. Ever since then she worried about my reading. He stood up in front of the whole class and like 'ha-ha you can't read'. I started crying and it really made me mad. When I first started reading, I was in the high group, until that day happened. So I stopped reading, and I would just say, 'I don't want to read.' So then they put me in the low group after that. So since that day, I don't like to read."

I had brought in a selection of books for Juanita to look through to choose a book to read. I told her a little about them, and she flipped through some of them. She chose *Storms* by Seymour Simon (1999), which surprised me since it was an informational book. It is a book from the Soar to Success series and is on the 6th grade reading level, with a 6th and up interest level. We ran out of time to begin reading, but we also talked about the kinds of strategies we will use.

Session 2

When Juanita came in, I explained that we would be doing some informal testing to see what her reading level was and to notice what reading strategies she was already using well. We tested using the *CARP*. Juanita was very nervous reading the word lists and often said "I don't know" without attempting to say the word. She tested frustration level on sixth grade and fifth grade word lists, and instructional on fourth grade and third grade lists. I didn't ask her to read the second grade list. We started on the fourth grade narrative reading passage, which she read aloud. She miscued nineteen times, eight of which she self-corrected successfully, but her comprehension was at the

independent level. She then did the other narrative fourth grade passage silently. Her comprehension was at the frustration level. She seemed really thrown off by this story, not recognizing the name Bartholomew and not being able to follow the story line.

I then moved to an expository passage, at the fifth grade level. She had a little prior knowledge, but had independent comprehension/recall. We then did a sixth grade passage. She read this one out loud, and scored at the instructional level for comprehension. I concluded from these results that Juanita lacked strategies for decoding words that were unfamiliar to her. Her comprehension was better on expository text than it was on narrative text. This could be a strength for her, as she chose the expository book to read together, rather than a narrative. A more detailed analysis of the *CARP* for Juanita will be discussed in Chapter 4, Results and Findings.

Session 3

Juanita was absent on Tuesday because she sprained her leg. She came back to school on crutches on Wednesday. On Thursday, her mother came to pick her up early from school to go back to the doctor. She came to school today in a wheelchair. She said the crutches hurt her arms too much.

We went back over the *CARP*. I told her it was very interesting and explained how some of her miscues occurred. She got the beginnings and endings of the words, but missed the middle, making a completely different word, or a nonsense word. We talked about her being nervous about reading words out loud and not wanting to take risks ("why try it when you know it will be wrong"). We worked with some of the words she missed by writing them on the table with the dry erase marker and analyzing

them. Juanita liked writing with the markers.

We then talked about the fact that she had better comprehension on the informational text than the narrative. I pointed out strategies she used well, such as going back and getting a running start. "One of the things you do real well is, you go back and repeat...that's a good strategy to use. If you get stuck, that's something you can do is go back and get a running start. Hopefully, you are thinking to yourself, wait, that didn't make sense, let me go back. You self corrected. That's another good strategy. When you say something wrong, you are recognizing it and looking at it again and checking it and getting it right the second time. You did a real good job at that. You also used some words that still made sense, and that's OK."

We picked up the *Storms* and looked through it, talking about what it was going to be about. I suggested we read, alternating pages, and she seemed to like that idea. When she miscued several words, I suggested that she try to find small words within the larger word, and on shorter words, to think of words with the same endings that she knows, to help with sounds. We used the dry erase markers to work with *shred*.

I asked her to try to visualize the information as she was reading it to help with comprehension. We discussed the information as we went along. We had a discussion of pronunciation of words because of Spanish (*ch* and *sh* sounds, and she said she pronounces *world*, *worl*). We discussed words that she had trouble with, such as *anvil*, *cumulonimbus*, and *squall*. She then said, "I want to start over with that sentence." She pronounced the words correctly the second time. When Juanita had difficulty trying to pronounce a word, she would often stick out her tongue and say "blah" and then go back

to reading. On the word *cleanse*, she said she wanted to pronounce it (correctly), but was looking at *clean*. I suggested that if she knows she has heard a word before, go ahead and pronounce it the way you know it should be, even if it doesn't look right.

I read the next page and pointed out that I had to self-correct in a spot. She mentioned that she wasn't really listening to me, that she was looking at the pictures. I suggested that she follow along the words with me when I read so she will recognize the words when she sees them as she is reading. When she got to the word *outdoors*, she said *outside*. She went back and self corrected. I pointed out that *outside* would make sense there, too, and that she used the strategy of looking at what the word looks like (the *d*) to recognize that outside was not correct.

Juanita was very pleasant throughout the session and seemed genuinely interested in the content of the book. She seemed to be less nervous reading aloud this session.

Session 4

We didn't have the video camera available for this session. We finished reading *Storms*. Juanita read most of it herself, instead of alternating pages. She seemed to be more comfortable reading herself. She struggled with the words *micro*, *sudden*, and *heard*. We made a list of all of the words she had trouble with in the back of a spiral notebook. It seemed interesting to me that Juanita miscues on so many easy words, yet reads many harder words fluently. I felt that much of her decoding problem was simply not enough reading practice.

After we finished the book, we got out the spiral notebook and I asked Juanita to

think about some things she might like to write about and make a list. She wrote a list of topics, then we talked about them.

Session 5

Due to Juanita's injury, she was unable to perform the duties of an office aide, which was her elective during eighth period, the last period of the day. She told me that she was just sitting in the office all period with not much to do. So, I spoke with our principal and counselors and asked if I could let Juanita come to my room eighth period for our reading apprenticeship two days a week. They agreed without hesitation, so I informed Juanita. She was very happy about this arrangement, probably mostly because it meant she would not have to stay after school on those days! I was pleased with the arrangement because Juanita's attendance had been very irregular during the after school time, and I felt that it would be better during school hours.

The first day of this arrangement, Juanita needed to work on a project for science, and asked if I would help her on the computer. I decided that this would be a good chance to see how she worked with computer text. We worked together on the computer making banners for her project. She used the Printshop program, which required her to read instructions, decide on titles for the banners, and import graphics. We discussed these processes as reading processes. She created some very well produced banners and was pleased with her product.

Session 6

I brought in another selection of books for Juanita to choose from. Juanita picked *Mummies* by Charlotte Wilcox (1999) to read next, which is another

informational book on the same level from the Soar to Success series. She immediately started discussing the picture on the front of the book (it's a face of a mummy). I had also brought in the electronic speller, and she asked me what it was. I explained that we could use it to check the spelling of words she may want to write. We could also make a word list of words she had trouble with in the book to practice before reading each time. She seemed really interested in using it, and paid close attention while I showed her how it worked. I explained that I had gone back through the tapes and written down words that she had trouble with in *Storms*, so that she could have her own word list. She read the words that I had typed in, struggling with several of them (*cumulonimbus* and *micro*).

We went back to *Storms* for familiar reading. She said it didn't matter which part she read over again, because she liked the whole book. I chose the beginning of the book, so she could get her *cumulonimbus* word in. She read with few miscues. I prompted her to "go back and read that sentence again so you can fix it up". I asked her what strategies she used to figure out *single*. She said, "I don't know, I just looked at it, and I thought about it like signal, single." I said, "So you were trying different things? Were you looking at how the letters were - how they were lined up? (pointing to the letters in *single*) Did you see the word *sing* there?" She said, "That's the first thing I saw." I said, "Good!", because that's one of the strategies we've been working on - seeing the little words in the big words." On the next page, the first sentence, Juanita read the word *world* correctly, pronouncing the *d*. She looked up as she finished the sentence and said, "Ahh! I said it right!!" I said, "Perfectly!" She then finished

reading the section of the book. I explained to her that she could read that part several times over the next semester to practice reading fluently.

Next, I asked her if we could do some writing before we started *Mummies*. I explained that since the state writing test was coming up, I thought we could work on developing a good paragraph. I said, "How are you feeling about your writing?" She said, "I think I can pass if I don't have, like, distractions." We started writing a paragraph to elaborate a reason why her mom should let her go dancing (dancing was the first thing on the list she made in the spiral). After she wrote her first reason, I said, "Now, for the rest of the paragraph, you want to talk about that same idea. That's the important thing on the state test. Once you have your first reason, you want to talk about that reason for a whole paragraph." Juanita talked through some extension of her ideas, then started writing. We talked through each idea before she wrote about it. She asked how to spell *practice*, so we looked it up in the electronic speller. I showed her how to work it. We then discussed the length of what a test writing sample should be, and amount of elaboration. I asked her to read back over her paragraph to see if it made sense. She read it out loud, and made a few changes.

Last, we started *Mummies*. She loved the pictures, so I said, "I think we should look at all the pictures, first." We looked through them and talked about them until we were called to the gym for a pep rally.

Session 7

We started out reading familiar reading from *Storms*. She read the first section again. She pronounced *cumulonimbus* correctly, so I said "Wow!" She smiled really

big, then she continued reading the section. On the last page, I decided to try another strategy because she was reading very monotone. I said, "OK, I want to try something. I'm going to read this last paragraph, then you are going to read it. I want you to try to read it with more expression. You talked about wanting to read out loud better, you know, like in class in front of people. So, it makes people understand what you're reading better if you read it with expression instead of just kind of all one voice." I then read the paragraph. She started to read it, but was very hesitant. She said, "Do I have to read like that?" I explained that she didn't have to sound exactly like me, but to put some expression into her reading. She still was very hesitant, so I said I would read the first sentence again. She repeated it with much more expression. I said, "Good!" Can you hear the difference?" At the end, I said, "Good! That sounded much more interesting!"

Next, Juanita started reading *Mummies*. We discussed parts of the book as she read. She didn't know *embalming*, so we talked about it. When she finished the first section, I said, "This is interesting, isn't it? What are they saying so far? What's mummification?" She talked about the bacteria and fungus, not realizing that it was the lack of those that results in mummification. We discussed all the ways that keep the bacteria and fungus away which result in the mummification process. We looked at the pictures again and talked about how the mummies looked. She commented about the time being up so fast, and I said it was because she came in late so we were late getting started. I encouraged her to be on time so we could read more. She smiled.

Session 8

Juanita immediately picked up the electronic speller, turned it on, and started reading her words. She said she liked it. I showed her how to add words, and said that she could type them in from now on. She asked which book she should read, and I suggested that we go ahead to *Mummies* and reread the part she read last time. She started over with the first section. She struggled with *ragged*. She used a soft g sound, and said she hadn't heard that word before. I asked her why she stopped when she read *burned* and corrected it to *buried*. She said, "Cuz, I don't know, I just figured it was wrong because the way I read it, some were buried, some were burned, and I remembered it from the last time." I said, "So you remembered that burned wasn't right from last time. So what did you do to figure it out? What did you look at?" We talked about the lack of the *n* in *buried*, so it couldn't be *burned*. She read with much more expression during this section. She struggled with *preserved* and didn't know the meaning. We talked it through. When she started to read again, she commented, "I remember most of these words from last time." She had trouble with *produce*, so I suggested she start the sentence over. She got it that time. After she finished, I commented on how well she read it, and even with expression! She continued new reading for two more pages. She had a lot of trouble with the sentence, "We must also remember that a mummy, though once really alive, is now really dead." She didn't understand how to read the clause within the commas. When she finished the section, I said, "I had an idea when you were having trouble with this sentence form when you were getting confused. I was thinking we might make up a sentence that has this same

form, but that's about something you know from everyday life that would make more sense to you. Because that's a good sentence form for you to use in your writing, too. So, I was thinking of something like, uh, who's a friend of yours?

J - "Jennifer."

M - "So, 'Jennifer, though my friend,' 'now what's something Jennifer might do that is not friendly - does she ever do anything that makes you mad?'"

J - "Not really."

M - "Well, we'll just make that up and pretend that she does. 'Jennifer, though my friend, sometimes makes me mad.' It shows an opposite, like 'McDonalds hamburgers, though bad for me, really taste good.'

Then she went on to make up a sentence about her boyfriend, Henry. When we finished, she said, "OK, I understand now."

Juanita asked if she could put some words into the electronic speller list. She put in *recently*, *linen*, and *patients*. She then read all of the words in her list.

I asked Juanita if she had been reading any in her classes. She commented, "Yeah, I did, like, we were reading in our books about the Japanese and how they put them in the camps and everything like that.

M - "Was this in your English class, or history?"

J - "It was in Reading. And I read, like, a whole paragraph."

M - "How did you feel about it?"

J - " I feel happy. I only messed up like one word."

M - "and nobody made fun of you."

J - (nodded no)

M - "Good! That's great, I'm glad to hear that."

J - "I used to try to read the whole word and now I see the little words in the big word and that helps me."

M - "Do you feel like you are reading faster?"

J - "Uh huh." (smiled)

Next, we wrote some of her words on the table with the dry erase markers. She wrote *patients, sudden, linen, flatten, blanket, cumulonimbus* (had a little trouble), *recently, heard, micro*, and all of the words in her speller. When she wrote *visible* correctly, she exclaimed, "Cool!" Then, when we were finished, she commented, "Is it time to go already?" I said, "Yeah, doesn't the time go by fast? We have so much fun!" She replied, "When I'm in the office, it seems to go forever, so I like being in here better." I said, "I like it better when you are in here, too!"

Session 9

Juanita started by reading the words from the electronic speller. We reviewed the sentences she wrote last time. I gave her a choice of *Mummies* or *Storms* to read for familiar reading. She chose *Mummies*. She chose to start at the beginning of the book again. She miscued *ragged* again, and said *Europe* for *Egypt*. When she said *burned*, she immediately self corrected to *buried*. I commented about how fast she corrected herself. She continued reading. She stopped to add the word *permanent* to her word list.

She continued reading the next chapter for new reading. She miscued *recognize*. She couldn't figure it out, even with my prompting to use context and look at the

syllables to sound it out. I supplied the word, then asked her if she had heard the word before. She said yes. She read the sentence over correctly. She then miscued *lavish* and *expected* in the next sentence. We worked through it the same way. Then I said, "Is it making sense? Let me read the sentence and you listen to it and see if it makes sense to you." I read the paragraph, modeling expressive reading. When I said *expected*, she said, "Oh, expected!" I reminded her to look at the middle of the word (she had said *excepted*). She wanted to start over and read the sentence again. She really struggled with *lavish* and *expected*. She kept reading the sentence over and over until she was happy with it. She seemed to enjoy doing this, laughing when she miscued the same way a few times. We stopped and put these two words in the electronic speller. "I want to try it one more time." She still miscued *expected*, but we kept going! I didn't want to interrupt her again. At the end of the chapter, we discussed how amazing the pyramids were. She read the captions to the pictures and we talked about them. She wanted to continue reading. We had a good time reading and discussing the information about how mummies were made. We both thought it was gross when it talked about removing internal organs and removing the brain through the nose!! When she got to *decorated*, which was divided on two lines, she had trouble seeing it. I worked through it with her, then she said, "Oh, I see it now." We talked about hieroglyphs, and I showed her the picture to illustrate it. We wrote *casing* on the table with the dry erase marker, with *case* first, to help pronunciation. At the end of one section, she stopped and explained why the items were placed in the coffin, remembering earlier context about the Egyptians believing in life after death and that the spirit would need certain items. She had such a

pleased look on her face! I commented, "You seem to be remembering what you read really well. Do you feel like you are understanding it all? She said,"Yeah, I understand it."

Juanita then put more words into the electronic speller. She put in *typical* and *hieroglyphs*. She wanted to add *natron*, too. I also pointed out her transversals of *strips* and *straps*, and to watch the vowel sound. She kept looking for words from the book to put into the speller. I think she really liked typing the words in and reading them from this! She read the words again, and really struggled with some of them.

Next, she read a legend that was on one of the pages in a side box. We talked about the way legends are passed down through oral tradition. Then we talked about all of the things we have today that they didn't have back then. We ended by talking about how well Juanita was doing, and she commented that her mother had been asking her what she did in our sessions. I told her we would put together some clips of video for her mother to see.

Session 10

Juanita got out the electronic speller and started reading her words. She discovered the thesaurus feature, and we explored it for a little while. She continued reading her words. When she got to *lavish*, she pronounced it correctly, so I said, "Yay!" She smiled and said, "I remembered it!"

She opened *Mummies*, and we searched through to decide where we stopped last time. We laughed again about the part that explained removing the organs . I commented about how interesting the book was. I asked if she had learned any of this in

sixth grade when they studied Egypt in World History. She said no, that she had not been here until the last month of sixth grade. She said she remembered that she was here for a field trip, then they studied Medieval times. She said when she out of state, they also studied Medieval times, so I commented that she got that study twice, and completely missed the study of Egypt. I said it was good that she was reading this, then. I asked, "Are you still enjoying this book?" She said, "Yeah, I like it. My mom is like, what are you reading? I'm reading a Mummy book. She goes, ah." I said, "Did you tell her that it's not a story, but an informational book?" She said, "Yeah, I told her they pull the organs out of their nose is all I told her. She was like, 'I'm eating here!'" We laughed. She started reading where we stopped last time. I decided that she should go on and read now that she was so interested and doing so well, rather than go back and reread, or we would never finish the book. She stopped at the word *mourners* and asked what the word was. I asked her to look at it, which she did, and she pronounced it. At the end of the sentence, we stopped and discussed the concept of *mourners* and *hired mourners* at the Egyptian funeral. She had trouble with *ceremonies*. I prompted that the *c* had the soft *c* sound, and she got it. She had trouble with *sacrifices* and we chunked it into syllables. She commented on *unfortunately* because it was a divided word at the end of a line. She said, "I hate words like that." I said, "When they divide them?" She said "Yeah, it makes it hard," then continued on and got the word. She miscued *rob* ("roam, rub"), so I said, "Think about the meaning there. Why would they build secret passages into the pyramids? What could they do later? 'So they could blank them later.'" She said, "rob them later?" I said, "Uh huh." She got *robbed* and *robbers* correctly in

the next two lines. At the of the paragraph, she said, "I want to read the whole paragraph over. I kept messing up. Can I read it over?" I said, "Sure, absolutely!" She did. When she finished, I said, "Ok, does that paragraph make sense to you now?" She smiled and said, "Yeah!" She paused several seconds on the next paragraph at *practice* and at *officials*. I didn't help her, and she got it after several seconds. I said, "I knew you were going to get it so I didn't help you!" We commented on the meaning of that paragraph after she finished it.

Juanita wanted to add *sacrifices* to her word list, so we talked about the meaning of the word in this story. We had a good discussion about the content of that whole page. I modeled wondering about some of the content. She then added the word to her electronic list. After she entered the word, I discussed with Juanita the options she has when coming to a word she doesn't know. "See, when you come across a word you don't know, you've got three or four ways to figure it out. One is just to look and sound it out. You have to look at what the word looks like and what letters are there, and break it down like you were doing. Sac - rif" Juanita interrupted and said, " See, but I couldn't put the *sac* in there. I got the *rif* part right." I said, "Uh huh, you were trying to go *scer*; you were trying to put the *s* and *c* together, but if it's got a vowel in the middle, it's not *scuh*, it's got to have that /a/, the *a* has the /a/ sound, so *sac*. Another way to figure out the word, instead of trying to sound it out, is to figure out what word would go there if you could read on past it and skip the word and then see if you can figure out what makes sense there, that's the best way to figure out a word. But you also want to be able to just look at the word and figure it out by sounding it out across." Juanita said, "real

fast". I said, "Yeah, and the more you do it, the faster you get! But it's OK to stop and look at it awhile, especially a long word that's new. I have to do that, too. When I'm reading, I come to words I don't know, too, and I have to stop and figure them out, like some of those names (in the mummy book)." We talked about how not pronouncing a name doesn't change the meaning of the paragraph, but not getting *sacrifices* would have prevented her from getting the meaning of that part of the book. She agreed, and said, "Like when I kept messing up and I was like, can I read it over?"

We looked up *sacrifices* in the thesaurus of the electronic speller. We talked about the different meanings, then she asked about some of the other features of the speller, so we played around with it for a few minutes.

Juanita continued to read in the book. After she finished reading a page, we talked about the content. When she came to *sacred*, she said *scared*, and then asked me if it was right. I said, "Is it? Ask yourself!" She said, "no", then looked back at it and said "sacred". I asked, "how did you figure it out?" She said, "Because *scared* is *sr* and I remembered that word *sac* you told me and *red*, *sacred*." When she said *ceremonies* correctly, she looked up at me and said, "I got it right!" She immediately went back to reading.

At this point I began to feel that Juanita was internalizing some of the strategies she needed to decode successfully. She was being metacognitive about her processes and beginning to feel more confident about her reading ability.

Session 11

Juanita asked me about a book that was sitting on the table, *Julie's Wolfpack*. I

didn't know whose it was and I thought it might have been hers. She said, "I thought it looked like a good book." I asked her if she had ever read *Julie of the Wolves*, and she said she hadn't. I said that this was a sequel, and she would probably really enjoy both of them. She read her words from the electronic speller, and I noticed how much more fluently she read them. She had trouble with *permanent*. When she came to *casing*, she used a short a sound, then said, "No", then read it correctly. She couldn't get *shrews*, so I worked it out with her using the dry erase marker on the table. I wrote *news*, which she read, then took off the *n* and added the *shr*. She immediately said *shrews*. After she got it, I said, "Look at the parts of the word, and look at what you already know." She went back to reading the word list from the speller, starting over. When she got to *permanent*, she tried saying *pre*. I asked her to look at it and "is it *pre*?" She said *per*, then *permanent*. We talked about Juanita having a good memory and to use that as her strength. She is remembering the words that have been in the list longer. I pointed out that she no longer has to sound out many of those words, because she now has them as sight words. I encouraged her to make lists of words she has trouble with in her classes and to practice them, because the more words she knows, the more fluently she will read.

We next started back with *Mummies*. I also explained that we would now begin to learn some test-taking strategies for use on the state test, since it would be coming up soon. She found where she left off last time, and began talking about the picture of the little boy mummy. We read the caption, and I said, "I wonder why" to model making predictions.

She started reading and said *Europeans* for *Egyptians*. She has done this several times, so I suggested that she look at the *Eg* beginning of the word to know it's not *Europeans*, but *Egyptians*. She miscued *practiced* in the second sentence, saying *proceeded*. When she finished the sentence, I asked, "Does that make sense?" She said "No. She immediately went back to the word *practiced*. I encouraged her to divide it into syllables. When she had trouble with *decorated*, I helped her divide it. Then, I said, "Remember to use your meaning, too, not just sounding it out. Think about , brightly ..., what would go there, that starts with the *d-e-c*?" I encouraged her to use all the strategies at the same time for decoding, not just one.

She continued reading. She miscued three words in one sentence, and had real trouble figuring it out. I said, "Let me read that sentence to you," so I could model it and have it make sense to her. We alternated reading the sentence. Then I said, "It's ok to stop if you're not sure, just think about the meaning..what does it mean.. what is it really saying there." We then talked about the pictures on the page. Then I suggested that I read the next page, then she read it. I wanted her to hear expressive reading modeled.

She then read the same page with very few miscues. We talked about the picture on the page and the content. We repeated this process on the next page. I read just the first section, then she repeated. She did really well, so I suggested she go ahead and do the next section alone. She pronounced *present* with the accent on the second syllable. I explained that it could be pronounced both ways, depending on the meaning. She explained how she had sounded it out, and I pointed out again that she needed to

consider the meaning, too, not just sounding it out. We stopped there, and she wanted to add some words to the electronic speller list. She chose *decorated*, *empire*, and *ragged*.

Next we moved to a test practice passage. I explained the test-taking strategy of reading the questions first, marking or highlighting important points in the passage. As she read the questions, I suggested that she mark key words in the questions. She read the passage, then we did the questions together. I asked her to think aloud as she figured out the answers, so I could hear how she got her answers. I prompted her to look for evidence in the passage each time.

This passage was a laminated one that I had set up as a Light-Right. It has the correct answers connected with aluminum foil strips to a connection at the top of the page, and is designed to be checked with a continuity tester. The clip from the tester is held to connection at the top of the page, then the point of the tester is held to the answer choice. If the answer is the correct one, the light on the end of the tester lights up. I showed Juanita how to use it, then she checked her answers. She got them all correct with scaffolding of the process, so every one lit up the tester. She was very excited that she got them all correct. She said she would like to do more of these practices to get ready for the real test.

Session 12

Juanita's cousin was visiting today, so she was in the room with us. It didn't seem to distract Juanita at all. She spent the first part of our time gluing a poster for her science class that was due. She was worried about finishing it because she didn't have any glue at home, so the librarian had given her some.

When we got started on our session, Juanita started out by reading her words off of the electronic speller. I think she liked the hands-on aspect of it. She also felt successful when reading the words. We next did another practice test passage. I modeled thinking through the questions, and we discussed each answer choice. She seemed to be able to reason through them. We talked about fact and opinion questions, and how the statement has to come from the passage. I taught her the two step strategy of eliminating the facts from opinion questions first, narrowing down the answers to just opinions, then seeing which one is actually in the passage. She could distinguish between fact and opinion statements. I asked her if she knew how to scan, looking for a particular word from the question in the passage. She said she did, and we did it together. On the word meaning question, she was misinterpreting the meaning of one of the incorrect answer choices, which made her choose the wrong answer. She enjoyed checking the questions with the continuity tester.

Next, Juanita read some from *Mummies*. She told her cousin, "This is an awesome book! We've really learned a lot about mummies from this book. It's nasty, though! They take the organs out of their nose!" That fact really stuck with her! We discussed some facts from earlier in the book that were alluded to in the section she was reading. She had good recall. She read very fluently in several sections. When she started having trouble, she did the "stick out the tongue" thing. She struggled over *mesa verde* and I asked her if she knew Spanish. She said she couldn't read Spanish. I wished she had learned to read Spanish before English!

Session 13

We had to change locations, because the room we were using was being used by the Math Specialist for state test workshops. We moved to a corner of the library. I liked the setup for the video camera better, because it shows Juanita's face clearer.

She read her words from the electronic speller. She was still reading them slowly, but she did work to decode when she didn't recognize the word. I got my own copy of *Mummies* so I wouldn't have to look over her shoulder. She found where we left off and started there. When she miscued *caverns*, pronouncing it with a long *a*, she looked up and asked if it was right. I said, "Can you do it in chunks?" She went back to it and pronounced it correctly. After she finished one page, I asked her how she figured out the word *relatives* when she had trouble. She said she broke it down into *re-late-ives*. I also asked her if she read on past the word and did the meaning of the sentence help her figure it out. She nodded. When I asked her how she got *beneath*, she said she just sounded it out. I suggested that she try to use more than one way to figure out the words, including using the meaning. We talked a minute about using the meaning to help figure it out. I also asked her about the other words she miscued on that page.

After one page, we discussed the picture and caption, which was of a gravestone. I related it to Shakespeare's gravestone with the curse written on it, and told her about it. Then she continued to read. When she miscued *storage*, I waited until she finished the page and asked her what the word was. She said "strong, strange," then "I don't know". I said, "Look at it again." She said, "storage". I said, "Don't just say I don't know, because you do! It make take you a few seconds, but you can do it." Juanita

smiled and nodded while I was saying this. I could tell looking back at the video, that both of us were tired that day. She had a cold or allergies and was sniffing, and I just looked really tired! We stopped reading in the book so we could do a state test passage.

I got out my laminated passages, and asked her to do one of the narratives. When she had trouble pronouncing a name, I assured her it didn't matter if she could say the name - it wouldn't change the meaning. She read the questions first and couldn't pronounce the word that was in the word meaning question. I said that at this point it didn't matter, but you do have to find the meaning. I asked her what will she have to do? She said "Read the whole paragraph where the word is." I said, "Yes, and if you can't pronounce the word, you still should be able to figure out what the word means." She had trouble on another question with *dreaded*. I encouraged her to spend the time it takes to figure it out when it's a word that will be important to the meaning of the question. "There is plenty of time to do it, so just take your time and figure it out." Then I asked her to read the passage silently and to mark any parts that remind her of the questions asked.

We then worked through the questions out loud. I asked her to think aloud again while finding her answers. When she picked an answer, I asked her to tell me how she got her answer. When she told me, I said, "So you found two pieces of evidence that says they have some things in common, so that's a good choice. Was there anything in the story that led you to believe... ." We worked through each answer choice this way.

She sounded out *unemotionally*, which was the word she had to define in the question. She read through the meaning choices, and picked the correct one. We talked

about how she had to analyze the word parts to find the meaning, because the context clues didn't help in this case. On the next question, she showed that a real problem with test-taking is not knowing all of the words in the answer choices. The word *exaggerated* was in the correct answer choice, and she couldn't figure it out. We talked through it for quite a while, and I guided her to this answer, but she determined that she probably would have gotten it wrong because of that. On the next one, she got the answer right on her own, and showed me the evidence in the story. After we were finished, Juanita said she wished she could get them all right on the test like that. I said that I was sitting there helping her now, but she would get to the point where she didn't need that, and she could prompt herself with the same things I said to her.

Session 14

Juanita wanted to go through her words first. She picked up the electronic speller and started reading the words. She read all of the words correctly, except *empire*, which I prompted. I encouraged her for doing so well on them. I then suggested that we would work on state test passages until after the test, then we would go back to *Mummies*. This passage was an informational text.

Since Juanita didn't pass the schoolwide benchmark practice test before spring break, I decided that we needed to focus on test taking strategies for her. I knew she could read the passages and understand what she read, but she had trouble understanding what the questions were asking her to do. I showed her how to use the yellow dry erase marker to highlight the laminated passage, and reminded her to read the questions first. She started reading the questions, and had trouble with the word that

was in the word meaning question. I suggested again that she didn't really need to figure out the pronunciation at this point, but wait until she saw it in the story.

After she read the questions, I asked her if she wanted to highlight anything in the questions. She said yes, so I suggested that she highlight things that would help her remember what to look for in the passage. When she got to a question about a person named Juan Cortina, I asked her what she should highlight in that question that would remind her what to look for in the passage. She said, "Juan". I said yes, that she wanted to look for where they talked about Juan Cortina in the story.

After reading and highlighting the questions, we started talking about her testing location, because I wanted to see if she would be comfortable testing with me in a small group with study carrels so she wouldn't be distracted, and so she could read out loud to herself if she wanted to. She said, "Yeah" and smiled at me. I said, "I think that might be a good idea." She said, "Because I really tried hard on the test (she was referring to the practice test that she had failed). I said, "I know, I know you did." She said, "Cuz I feel like when people are around me I can't focus on that. I see everybody finishing and I want to hurry and finish." We talked about that for a few minutes and agreed that she would test in the small group with only five students and me. I assured her that we would try it out ahead of time to make sure that it wouldn't be distracting for them to read out loud to themselves in the study carrels. That idea seemed to really make Juanita feel better about testing. She said she really wanted to read out loud during the practice test, and would catch herself and stop, since she was in a classroom. I suggested that she do this passage out loud and see if it helps.

She started reading slowly, and when she came to one word she couldn't decode, she finally said "it doesn't matter" and kept going. She sped up as she got going, and read much more fluently. Sometimes when she encountered a word she had trouble decoding, she would say, "whatever", and keep going. After she finished the passage, I told her that she was doing the right thing by skipping over words she didn't know, as long as she was getting the main idea of what was going on in the passage. She smiled. She then said, "They only said one thing about that Juan dude." So she highlighted that sentence, then we started working through the questions.

I guided her through the questions, and modeled where to look in the passage. I gave her hints about reading everything on the page and interpreting the questions. As she read a question, I said, "OK, what are you going to do?" to try to get her to articulate the strategies. When she didn't do it, I would articulate the strategy myself. When she would guess an answer, I asked her how she got the answer, and to show me in the passage what she was basing it on. At the question about Juan Cortina, she was looking and talking to herself. All of the sudden, she lit up and said, "Ahhh, it's 'A'!" I asked how she knew, and she correctly told me what evidence she had in the passage. I said, "Good thinking!" We talked about that being an inferencing question and that she had to find the evidence in the story.

When she got to the summary question, I reminded her that it had to be about the whole story, and she chimed in and said "Whole thing" at the same time I did. She talked through the answer choices, and picked the correct answer, showing me how she got it. She included looking at the title and the sentence at the top of the page, which we

had talked about earlier. Finishing the questions, Juanita got out the light tester, and said, "I like this thing, here!" As she lit up each answer, showing she got it correct, she smiled. She really was excited that she got the Juan Cortina question right.

We talked about how long it took her to do this, but that was OK, because the test would be untimed and she could take all the time she wanted to. We then talked about taking breaks between the passages because it would be hard work to do six of them in a row. When we finished talking, I said we had only 5 minutes left, and Juanita asked if she could read some in *Mummies*. I said yes, and went to get it. She found where she stopped last time, and continued reading. She read one section, then we ran out of time. She said we were never going to get through. I offered for her to take it home, but she said no, she wanted to read it together.

Session 15

We started with a state test passage. As she read the questions, I again guided her to highlight parts of the question that would tell her what to look for in the reading passage. We talked again about the purpose of highlighting. She started reading aloud, and I praised her for reading the title first. She read the passage pretty fluently this time. She said, "I don't know that word" once, then kept right on going.

She talked through the answer choices for the summary question. I guided her strategy of asking, "Is that what the whole thing is about?" after reading each answer choice. She wanted to know if main idea was the same thing, so we talked about the similarities and differences of summary and main idea questions. I asked her to paraphrase the question, by saying, "What is the question really asking?" At one point,

she didn't know what *deliberately* meant. I supplied the meaning, then she chose that answer. I asked her, "Now, if you didn't know what that meant, how are you going to pick that?" We talked about eliminating the other answers, and trying to get the meaning of the words through the context. She said, "If I had you on every test, I'd like pass every one." I said, "To explain all the words? That would be nice, wouldn't it." We laughed together.

We also talked about how many questions she could miss and still pass the test. I pointed out that even though 58 was failing, it wasn't that far from passing. She only needed to get about five more questions right to pass the test. She was surprised about that. I told her that every two questions she got right would be about five points on the test, so she wanted to work hard for every question.

We continued to talk through the rest of the questions on the passage. She explained each answer, thinking aloud and discussing the evidence in the passage. I suggested another strategy, to read the whole passage a second time after answering the questions to verify the answers. She indicated that she might do that, since the test wasn't timed and she would have time to.

As soon as she finished, Juanita picked up *Mummies* and started to look for where she left off last time. She started reading , and I praised her for doing so much better at decoding words. I said, "You are using your strategies and you are getting them. You couldn't do that at first. You are doing really well now!" She finished up the chapter, reading pretty fluently on the last part.

Session 16

Juanita started with her word list this time. She read them very fluently this time! When she finished, she said, "I know everything!" We started on the next chapter of *Mummies*. She commented after reading the title. The title was, "Frozen in Time - *Mummies* Preserved in Ice". She said, "Ice! That's really neat, I didn't think they could do that in ice."

When she miscued the second sentence, she looked up at me for a reaction. I kept looking at the page, so she said, "I think I messed up." I said, "OK, what do you think you messed up on?" She struggled with *thaw*, saying *thraw*, so I asked her to look at it, pointed out that there wasn't an *r* in it, and then asked her to think about something frozen. She said, "thaw". I reminded her to use the meaning to help her figure out words. When she reread it, I said, "That makes sense now, right?" She nodded and said, "Yeah, I want to do that again." I said, "OK", so she read it over again. After she finished the paragraph, I commented that it reminded me of the movie, "Encino Man". She didn't know it at first, but after I told her a little about it, she remembered seeing it and added some details. I was trying to model connecting to another text.

Again, on the next page, she asked if she could go back and reread when she started struggling. It seemed to me that Juanita was reading much more fluently at that point. She still miscued, but self-corrected much more quickly and effectively. She didn't know the word *seeped*. We talked about the meaning. We also talked about the picture on that page. She used her strategy of reading the rest of the sentence to figure

out the word.

She had trouble with *severe*, too, and asked to put it on her word list. We got out the speller and added it and *seeped*. We found out that we had filled up the list, so we would have to take some out. I told her I wanted to write down all the words first before we deleted any, so she called them out to me and I wrote them down. After I wrote them all down, I asked her which ones she wanted to delete. She picked *heard*, *linen*, *typical*, *flatten*, *shred*, and *anvil*. She deleted them from the electronic speller herself. She was upset because she accidentally deleted *cumulonimbus*. I told her we could put it back in. She had to work through the spelling when she put it back in.

She then went back to reading. When she said *soldiers* instead of *sailors*, she paused and as I started to say "look at it," she said at the same time, "That ain't soldiers". She looked at it in silence for a few seconds, then said, "sailors". I asked her a question at the end of the page to see if she was comprehending the information, and she discussed it with me without hesitation. Then I asked her if this was a state test passage, what kind of questions could they ask. She replied with several questions, and supplied the answers when I asked. Then I offered a few questions which we talked about.

She started reading again, and didn't know what the *Alps* was. So, we talked about mountain ranges and climbing mountains, ski resorts, etc. When she got to *glacier*, she didn't know what that was either. When I told her it was a mountain of ice, she said, "Oh, I saw that on TV." When she finished the page, it was time to stop for the day. I asked her if she was getting tired of the book, or if she still liked it, and she

replied that she liked it . She said, looking at the picture on the front of the book, "I want to know about that head there." We opened the book to the same picture, and I read the caption. I commented that it looks like that will be an interesting chapter. She agreed.

Session 17

Juanita started out by telling me she had read in her History class. I said, "Was it an out-loud thing?" She said, "Uh huh. It was the whole class - I didn't get nervous or nothing, I didn't get embarrassed or nothing, I was just reading!" (Big smile!). I said, "Good for you!" Tell me about what you were reading. She said it was about Abraham Lincoln, and they were on the Civil War. We discussed the type of text they use, which is in a comic strip format. She said it's kind of confusing. She said she didn't really like it, she'd rather read it out of the book.

We started with a state test passage. She was excited because it was one of the flyer types rather than a narrative. She said she likes those because the question tells you what part to look in for the answer. I asked her to do this one totally on her own, then we would check her answers. She highlighted as she read the questions. She asked about one of the questions, not sure of what to highlight. She started reading the passage, and highlighted some in the passage as she read. She was subvocalizing during the passage.

She finished reading, and started answering the questions. When she finished the questions, I asked her to tell me how she got her answers. She showed me in the passage the evidence on which she based her answers. We talked about strategies for

each type of question as we went over them. On one question, she commented that I made it easy to understand when I started asking her questions about it, so I suggested that she needs to ask herself the same questions in her head during the test, since I won't be there to do that. At one point I modeled how I got an answer, since I would have arrived at the same answer, but in a different way. I wanted to model a variety of ways to think through the answer. We talked about propaganda techniques referred to in one of the questions. Juanita was really metacognitive about this passage, telling me just what she was thinking, and what did and did not make sense to her.

After we finished the questions, I showed her what I had observed about her techniques during reading. She read the questions first, she highlighted key words in the questions and in the passage, she read the whole passage (even though it was an advertisement and not a story), she whisper-read out loud, she went back to the passage to find evidence for the questions, and she considered all of the answer choices. I asked her if she came across any words she didn't know and she said yes, so I asked her what she did when that happened. She said she just looked at it and thought about it and if she didn't know it she kept reading because she didn't want to waste her time. Then I asked her if it ended up being a word that was important to a question and she needed to know it what would she do? She said, " I would keep reading the whole paragraph over and if I still can't get it I can go to the letters and keep on trying until I got it." I suggested that she could also think about what other word would make sense there in order to get the meaning even if she couldn't get the word. We talked again about relaxing, not rushing, and taking mental breaks during the test.

We started back in *Mummies* next. She wanted to read the words in her electronic speller first, so she did. When she got to *cumulonimbus*, she said, "Hey, they said that in science!" She told me that in her class they were studying the weather and clouds, and she was very excited that she knew about the cumulonimbus clouds.

She started reading the next chapter. When she got confused at the second paragraph, she asked if she could read that over. I said, "Sure, that's what you should do if it doesn't make sense." When it was time to go, I said so, and Juanita said, "I was like, I don't care, I want to read that to see what happens!" I said, "Good for you, I'm glad you are so excited about the book." She said, "I like that book" I said, "I like that book, too, I've learned a lot."

Session 18

Juanita immediately picked up the electronic speller and read her words. She really read them fluently by this time! I gave her a choice of state test passages to do, and she picked another graphic one. I asked her what strategies she was planning to use. She said, "Read the questions, highlight the stuff that's important, then read it, then go back over it and like...go back and find it, then answer it." We talked about main idea strategies, reading the title, and fact and opinion strategies.

She told me that she had done a practice passage in her English class and missed two. So I asked her which ones gave her the most trouble. We talked about inferencing questions. I also encouraged her to keep plugging away at the test and to not be tempted to guess. We again talked about mental breaks and using as much time as she needs. I then showed her the strategy of using 4 highlighter colors to mark evidence from the

story and said she could do that if she thought it would help and not confuse her.

She then did the passage and questions alone. She started to ask me a question about one, then when she read the question or answer choice out loud, she suddenly went, "Ohh, Never mind!" I said, "See, you can answer your own questions!" When she finished, I asked her to tell me how she got each of her answers. She showed me where in the passage the evidence for answers was located. She was able to think aloud about all of the answers, and also talked about why some of the wrong choices could not be the answer. I asked her about one of the distracter answers, and said, "See, they'll trick you! You know how to watch out for those things! Those are called distracters... but if you read all of it you'll see those..." She got all of the questions right that time and was able to tell me how she got each one. She really smiled when we finished! Her confidence was really built up, and I felt like she could pass the test! I told her that she really did a good job of thinking through each question and finding evidence. I offered for her to take the rest of the packet home to practice over the weekend and to show her mom how she could do them. She said, "Sure". She asked me if she could have a highlighter because she didn't have one. I told her to pick one out, and she picked the orange one. She then asked me if I wanted to see the pillow she was working on in her Career Life class. I said yeah, and she showed it to me and told me how she made it. I told her how pretty it was and that she had so many talents!

She wanted to read some more from *Mummies*, so she read one page, then time was up. She asked if she could read the caption under the picture on the next page about the Blue Babe, a frozen bison. I was excited that she was not anxious to leave, but

wanted to continue reading!

Session 19

The state test was over, so we were back in our little room instead of out in the library. Juanita started by reading her words from the electronic speller. She got all of them this time, without hesitation, except *severe*. She worked on it herself until she got it. She immediately knew where she was in *Mummies*, and turned to it. When she got to *samurai*, she didn't know what it was. I explained it, but she had never heard of it. She also didn't know the term, *Orientals*. When she had trouble getting *charcoal*, I asked her to look for the small words in it that she already knew. She said she saw *coal* now, but couldn't decode the *char* part. I pronounced *charcoal* and asked her if she had heard of charcoal. She said she had. I asked her to reread a portion that she miscued on the next page, and after she corrected it, she said, "I know where I messed up." I said, "You figured it out!"

We wondered together about the part of the information that was a little confusing. It had to do with using mercury in the mummification process. She also didn't know what parasites were, so I explained it. She kept reading for a few more pages, then I asked her if she wanted me to read awhile because she was loosing her voice. She said yes, so I read the rest of the page.

We went back to the chapter to look for words she had trouble with. She chose *samurai*, *Orientals*, I suggested *tombs*, and discussed with her the silent *b*. We got out the dry erase markers and wrote out *thumb*, *numb*, *tomb*, *bomb*, to show anytime *m* and *b* are together at the end of the word, you don't pronounce the *b*. She chose *embalmed*,

parasite, and *Buddhist* to add next. She started adding those, but we ran out of time and space in the speller. We stopped and said we would take out some more words and finish adding those next time.

Session 20

Juanita had her "Baby-Think-It-Over" with her from her Career Life elective, so things were a little different! The "baby" is a life-sized doll which has a computer chip that controls crying from the baby and actions taken by the student. It is designed to give students an experience that simulates caring for a real baby over a period of time.

Juanita wanted to read her words first, and went through them fluently until she reached *samurai*. I asked if she remembered what the word meant, and she didn't. I explained that it was the Oriental warriors, then asked her to look at the word and see small words in it. She said *sam*, then *samurai*. She finished the words, then we got out *Mummies*. We were almost through with it, and I asked her to recall what was in the last chapter. She looked back at it, and I directed her to the title and we talked about samurai warriors again but she couldn't remember much of the rest of the chapter. We looked back and read a portion about the Chinese mummy to help her remember. She read a sentence out loud, and I asked her to go back and fix it up. She said she knew what she had said. I asked what, and she said "usually", and then self-corrected to *unusual*. Her "baby" started crying about that time and she had to hold the key while we talked.

We continued to talk about the last chapter, and had a good discussion. We moved on to the next chapter, and when she read the title, she was confused by the dash,

so I explained that it is like a comma, but a longer pause. She said *uriel* for *Ireland*, then self-corrected, so after she finished the sentence, I asked her what she used to fix it up. She showed the first part of the word. I said also that it was starting to list countries, so that probably helped her, too. I reminded her to use the meaning to help her figure it out.

We looked up *bog* in the glossary, since it was in bold print. She read it out loud. She got confused on *decomposed* because it was divided on the lines. She figured it out, then also got confused on *moss*, not knowing what it meant. I explained what moss was, and she realized that she had heard of it before. I asked if she wanted to put that word into her word list, and she did, but we remembered that we had filled it up and would need to delete some words. We decided to wait until the end of the lesson to do that, so I wrote the word on a piece of paper to remind us to do it later.

We continued in the book. She had trouble pronouncing *combination*, and said she knew the word and told me the meaning, but just couldn't say it. So, I pronounced it for her. When she got to *strangled*, she said *strangely* twice, then looked up at me. I didn't say anything, so she looked back down and said "strangled with a rope". I asked her how she figured that out. She said, the "g-l-e-d at the end, plus it had rope". Finally, she used the meaning without my prompting! She asked me to write down the time, because she had to record how long the "baby" key was held to keep it from crying. I did that, then complimented her for paying attention to what she had to do with the baby. She kept reading, then stopped when she got to *evidence*. She didn't attempt it after several seconds of looking at it. I said, "Are you stuck?" She said yeah, and so I

helped her work it out. Then I said, does that make sense? She nodded. She finished the page, then we talked about that chapter for a few minutes. She then read the captions for the pictures at the end of the chapter. We worked with *lambskin*, since the silent *b* pattern was there again, and she picked up the dry erase marker and wrote it on the table.

After she finished the chapter, I asked her how she would go about studying this material if she had to know it for a class. I had thought it would be helpful for her to do a graphic organizer with the information. She said she would divide the information by the countries. I asked her if she had done a mind map or web before, and she said yes. I got out the large poster and some sticky notes. She wrote "*Mummies*" on one and stuck it in the middle. (I held her "baby" so she could write). She turned to the table of contents to get her categories. We worked on the web map together. She wrote on the chart and the sticky notes and came up with eight categories for spokes around the center. We talked about the categories as she wrote them. She picked the frozen mummies categories to start with. I encouraged her to scan the chapter and pick out important information to record on the sticky notes. She did this with interest. We discussed the process as we worked on it. When we had 5 minutes left, I asked her if she wanted to put her words into the electronic speller. She deleted *sudden*, then added *moss*.

Session 21

Juanita read her words. When she came to *moss*, I asked her if she remembered what it meant. She said no, so we talked about it again. She also wanted to talk about

the picture on the front of the book. There is another copy of the picture in the last chapter, so she turned to it and I read the caption under the picture. She then read the last chapter.

We worked with words she had trouble with. She really had trouble with *oddities*. She said she had never heard the word before, so I explained the concept. She said, "Oh I understand it now." As she read this chapter, we stopped several times and discussed and commented on what she was reading. After the end, we enjoyed looking back through the pictures and talking about the captions. She picked out some more words to add to her word list. I asked her if she had to take World History in High School, and suggested that she will probably study mummies sometime in school later. She said she would know a lot about it, and started recalling facts from the book! She said, "I pretty much know a lot of stuff."

She continued to flip through the book. Next, we talked about the mind map and how it worked. We wouldn't have time to finish it, since we only had finals week left, but we talked about how this strategy could help her to study. She said, "I wish we could finish it!" That made me wish we had started it earlier and completed it as we went along. We did work on it a little more.

I had found a hard cover copy of *Mummies* on the bargain table at the local bookstore, so I purchased it and gave it to Juanita at the end of this session. I wrote a note in the front, and I told her that I was glad she liked this book so much. I encouraged her to continue to read it over as many times as she wanted, because rereading it would help her get better and better at reading. She hugged me, and said she

loved the book and she couldn't wait to show it to her mom.

Session 22

We did the posttest of the *CARP*. I gave her some instructions, and encouraged her to relax and read the words slowly. Juanita read sixteen words correctly on the fourth grade, which was still instructional. She got thirteen correct on each of the fifth and sixth grade lists, which is one away from instructional, so I went on to the seventh grade list. She got fourteen, which is instructional. She only got six on the eighth grade list which is frustration level. I showed her the ninth grade list and asked her to just look over it and see if she knew any of the words. She got thirteen of them, which is frustration, but one away from instructional. She still has gaps in her decoding ability and her miscues show that she is still not paying attention to the middle of the word. However, she got several more words right on each list as compared to the pretest, so she has improved. When she finished, we worked through some of the words, because I wanted to see if she was familiar with the words once she heard them. She knew some, but hadn't heard such words as *biopsy* and *malignant*.

We started the reading passages next. I started on the seventh grade narrative. Juanita read it at 90 words per minute. She had minor miscues, but self corrected most of them. She repeated phrases several times. She could not read *absentmindedly* and *campaign*, which I supplied for her. Juanita was able to retell the story in great detail with 100% accuracy. She inferred beyond the text appropriately and told it in correct sequence, using her own words.

Next we did the seventh grade informational text about tsunamis. She said she

didn't know anything about them. She chose to read it out loud. She read this passage very slowly, laboring over many of the words. She read it at 57.3 words per minute. We had an interruption before she started retelling. The counselor came in and presented Juanita with a yearbook that she won in a drawing. She was very pleased to get it. When we got back to the retelling, she was able to retell ten out of twelve details, which is 83% and instructional level. We talked about the details that she couldn't remember. She seemed very interested in the content of this passage.

Next, we did the eighth grade narrative passage. I asked her to read it silently, and she agreed. I left the room while she read, and she subvocalized at first, then began reading aloud softly. I came back before she was finished, and she kept reading out loud. She couldn't read *debris obstructing*, so I said, "What meaning needs to go in that sentence? She started over, and read it correctly. She didn't know *havoc*, so I explained it to her. She read slowly and paused at words she didn't immediately know. When she finished, she retold the story with 100% accuracy. She told it in her own words and added appropriate dialogue. She told it in sequence and in detail. She was very pleased when I told her this was an eighth grade passage and she did so well on it.

Last, we did the eighth grade expository passage about fingerprints. She read it out loud at 85 words per minute. She retold the details with 78% accuracy, forgetting some details toward the beginning of the passage. After she was finished, I shared with Juanita that she had improved this semester, and even though she still had trouble reading some words, the important thing was that she remembered what she read. She improved the most on narrative. I told her that she should be able to do the work in

ninth grade, but to make sure she spent enough time on it. I encouraged her to practice reading this summer. Just like a musical instrument, you can't just stop in the summer, but continue to practice. I suggested that she keep a word list like we did in the electronic speller to practice. She did so well learning those as sight words, and she needs to continue to build her vocabulary. I said that the best way to keep learning new words is to read more, and the more informational things she reads, the more she will learn about things that will build her background knowledge which will help her read better.

We reviewed some of the strategies we learned this semester. I asked her what are some things she can do when she is given material to read in class, like science. She said she could scan it real fast, read the title, read the questions first if there were any. I suggested that she could ask herself if there is anything she already knows about this to call up what she already knows, set a purpose for reading and give her a hook to add information to.

I also challenged Juanita to be in school every day next year. She was absent a lot this year, and she said this is the first time she has had so many absences. I said in high school it was really important to be there every day. I told Juanita that she had come so far this semester and I knew that she could be anything she wanted to be. If she will stay in school and graduate, she will be a success at what she wants to do. I asked her how she pictured high school. She said it will be a lot of work, but more fun. We talked about turning in work on time and keeping a list of assignments. I asked her if she wanted to go to college. She said she might go into the job corps. We talked about

different work/study programs. We also talked about junior college and transferring to a four year college. I encouraged her to watch for the opportunities that are out there for women. I said, "Don't underestimate yourself!"

Data Analysis

The primary data set was qualitative in nature and included videotapes of twenty-one sessions with one student and twenty-two sessions with the second student. Also included were running records, student interviews and questionnaires, teacher questionnaires, parent questionnaires, and journal reflections by the researcher/teacher. Additionally, there were elements of quantitative data, including state test scores and informal reading inventory scores from the *Classroom Assessment of Reading Processes*, as well as running records taken from the *CARP* and from segments of reading during sessions.

The videotapes were analyzed in two ways. First, I viewed each session and took notes, adding to my reflective journal. Second, five sessions from each student, every fourth session, were transcribed. The reflective journal notes and the transcribed sessions were then coded to represent categories that reflected the research questions as recommended by Merriam (1988) and Gall, Borg and Gall (1996). I constructed the categories as I engaged in reviewing the data. I used a word processing program to "cut and paste" the coded sections into separate pages, compiling each category as a file. The final categories were: Student Attitude, Student Choice, Fluency, Vocabulary, Researcher Observation, Taught Strategy, Modeled Strategy, Reinforced Strategy, Use of Strategy Prompted, Use of Strategy Unprompted, and Metacognitive Comment.

Next, I analyzed the questionnaires and informal reading inventories for qualitative data, and entered appropriate data into the category files. Following procedures suggested by Merriam (1988) and Gall, Borg and Gall (1996), I analyzed these files for patterns that suggested evidence for answers to my research questions.

The quantitative data was reported as a comparison chart for pretest and posttest scores for each case as additional evidence for the answers to the research questions. Data from all of these sources provided "thick description" (Merriam, 1988, p. 27) and "triangulation" (p. 69). "The opportunity to use multiple methods of data collection is a major strength of case study research" (p. 69).

Narrative discussion was used to report coded results of questionnaires, videotapes, and reflective journals, and to describe the nature of the interactions that occurred in answer to the research questions.

CHAPTER 4

RESEARCH RESULTS AND FINDINGS

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to explore the interactions that take place during a reading apprenticeship that facilitate the learning of reading strategies by adolescent students who are at the middle school level and are still at-risk for reading failure and to investigate how a reading apprenticeship affects reading achievement in the areas of fluency, vocabulary development, comprehension, and the self-perception of the two readers.

Research Questions

This qualitative study was designed as a case study. It was designed to answer the following questions regarding the facilitation of learning by adolescent students in the environment of a reading apprenticeship:

- 1) How will a reading apprenticeship impact reading achievement in the area of fluency?
- 2) How will a reading apprenticeship impact reading achievement in the area of comprehension?
- 3) How will a reading apprenticeship impact reading achievement in the area of vocabulary development?
- 4) How will a reading apprenticeship impact the self-perception of the reader?
- 5) What reading strategies were directly or indirectly taught or modeled during the

reading apprenticeship?

6) What are the nature of the interactions that seem to be the most important in facilitating the learning during a reading apprenticeship?

Results

The design of this study was a qualitative case study of two cases representing a reading apprenticeship with adolescent students. To answer the research questions, data from videotaped sessions, a reflective journal by the researcher who was a participant observer in the role of teacher in the apprenticeship, state test results, informal reading inventory results, running records, and questionnaires from teachers, students and parents involved in the study were all analyzed for quantitative and qualitative information. The quantitative data helped to answer questions one through three, and the qualitative data helped to answer all six questions. This triangulation of data is in accordance with suggested case study procedures (Gall, Borg & Gall, 1996; Merriam, 1988).

Results of Question 1

How will a reading apprenticeship impact reading achievement in the area of fluency? To answer this question, I define fluency and how it can be measured, then describe the nature of the interactions in the two reading apprenticeship cases that impacted fluency.

Strecker (1999) shows a consensus of research regarding the major components of oral reading fluency to be "rate, accuracy of word identification, text phrasing or chunking, and prosodic features" (p. 1). Quantitative measures taken from the data in

this study include rate and accuracy of word identification which were taken from running records from each student. Qualitative measures taken from reflective journals by the researcher and transcripts of sessions include statements which are coded as evidence of fluent reading. "Listening to students read a selection orally enables you to judge their fluency in terms of both phrasing and intonation and reading rate" (Barr, Blachowicz, & Wogman-Sadow, 1995).

Table 1 shows a comparison of reading rate and accuracy of word identification for each student taken from running records from the pretest and posttest of the *Classroom Assessment of Reading Processes (CARP)* (Swearingen & Allen, 1997), and during three sessions distributed across the time of the study.

Table 1

Running Record Analysis for Juanita				
Session	Text- Level	WPM	Error Rate	Accuracy
Pretest	Expository-6	80	1:13	93%
Pretest	Narrative-4	77	1:27	96%
Six	Expository-6	59	1:31	97%
Twelve	Expository-6	69	1:28	96%
Twenty-one	Expository-6	78	1:122	99%
Posttest	Expository-8	85	1:61	98%
Posttest	Narrative-7	90	1:64	98%
Running Record Analysis for Ben				
Pretest	Expository-6	63	1:17	94%
Pretest	Narrative-6	66	1:23	96%
Five	Narrative-6	81	1:42	98%
Eleven	Narrative-7	90	1:38	97%
Eighteen	Narrative-7	115	1:54	98%
Posttest	Expository-8	91	1:46	98%
Posttest	Narrative-8	99	1:39	97%

From pretest to posttest, Juanita's rate improved from 80 words per minute on

sixth grade expository to 85 words per minute on eighth grade expository. Her accuracy rate grew from 93% to 98% while moving up two grade levels. On narrative text, her rate grew from 77 words per minute on fourth grade to 90 words per minute on seventh grade. Her accuracy on narrative also grew from 96% to 98% while moving up three grade levels. During the regular sessions while reading the expository texts that she chose, Juanita's reading rate grew steadily. Her best record was a portion from the last chapter of *Mummies*, which she read at 78 words per minute, but with only two errors, giving her an error rate of 1:122 and 99% accuracy.

Ben had an improvement in reading rate from pretest to posttest on the *CARP* from 66 words per minute to 99 words per minute on narrative, while moving up two grade levels. His expository text reading rate improved from 63 words per minute to 91 words per minute while moving up two grade levels. Ben read narrative text during the regular sessions, and his reading rate also improved steadily. His accuracy rates remained 97% and 98% with error rates from 1:38 to 1:54.

Both Ben and Juanita improved in their use of decoding strategies which is shown by an increase in accuracy. They self-corrected more often, while still increasing their reading rate. Barr, Blachowicz, and Wogman-Sadow (1995) cite average reading rates from the Gilmore Oral Reading Test (1968) as 136 - 167 words per minute for grade level 8.8 (p. 59). Ben and Juanita are still below average in reading rate for their grade level.

Through the qualitative data from my journals and transcripts, I noticed that both Ben and Juanita's fluency was not necessarily a steady linear improvement, but

varied depending on several factors. The days they were in happy moods, they read faster, with fewer errors, and more expressively. The days they were tired or in a bad mood, they read more slowly and with less expression. Ben especially seemed greatly affected by his interest in the story. When he would first start out a new reading, he would read more slowly and make more errors. However, when the action became exciting or more interesting to him, he would speed up and make fewer errors, his body language changing along with his interest, leaning in or sitting up straighter when his interest was piqued. When Ben and Juanita first started to read at each session, they took an efferent stance. They each read to be correct and to pronounce the words. As they continued and became interested in the books they were reading, their stance shifted to an aesthetic stance. They began to read faster and with fewer errors as they enjoyed the books.

Juanita particularly had difficulty decoding words. Using the electronic speller to record difficult words was a beneficial activity for her. She was motivated to read the words at each session becoming more fluent as she practiced them. As a result, when she would go back to reread familiar passages, she knew those words and would read the text more fluently. Many times in my journal I commented on how much more fluently she was reading, sometimes referring to the word list and sometimes to the text:

"She is much more fluent with these now." (session 11)

"She started reading slowly, but sped up as she got going and read much more fluently." (session 14)

"Juanita started with her word list. She read them very fluently this time!"

(session 16)

"She got all of them this time, without hesitation, except 'severe'." (session 19)

Some of the decoding strategies I encouraged Juanita to use slowed down her fluency temporarily, but once she internalized the strategies her fluency improved.

These strategies are discussed in the results of question five. Several times during the sessions, I encouraged Juanita to read with more expression. I also modeled expressive reading, and practiced echo reading with her to help her hear expressive reading.

Ben also used the electronic speller for a word list, but he did not seem as motivated to use it as Juanita did. He did, however, begin to use decoding strategies that were taught or modeled during the reading apprenticeship sessions which improved his ability in word recognition. In my journal of Ben's reading apprenticeship, I commented early about his lack of fluency, then in later sessions, the comments were more about his developing fluency:

"He reads portions really fast and with expression, then slows down to word-by-word when he stumbles." (session 4)

"When he got to the word 'tough' he hesitated, then all of a sudden said, 'That's one of our words!' I said, 'It is!', then he repeated 'how..tough'. He nodded confidently when he said it." (session 9)

"He was reading really slowly." (session 11)

"He still reads rather choppily, unless he gets into the story, when he reads much more fluently." (session 12)

"He seemed to read more fluently today. He still miscued some, but self-

corrected and reread when he needed to." (session 15)

"I rarely see him just stop and say, 'I don't know that word' anymore like he did at the beginning." (session 18)

"He read it very fluently this time, with much more expression." (session 19)

I also encouraged Ben to read with more expression and I modeled expressive reading. During session nineteen, I showed him a tape of his early reading and let him follow along in his book. We then took out the tape, and he reread the portion of text he had watched. We repeated this, and I noticed that he purposefully read with more expression each time.

Results of Question 2

How will a reading apprenticeship impact reading achievement in the area of comprehension? To answer this question, I define comprehension and how it can be measured, then describe the nature of the interactions in the reading apprenticeship that impacted comprehension.

Comprehension of written text is accomplished through reading and gaining meaning from the text. "Reading is a constructive process. Readers construct their own meaning of a text by combining their schemata with clues and concepts that the author provides" (Swearingen & Allen, 1997, p. 1). Using the *Classroom Assessment of Reading Processes (CARP)* (Swearingen & Allen, 1997), comprehension can be measured and reported as independent level, instructional level, or frustration level. Independent level is where the reader can easily read and understand materials without help from the teacher, instructional level is where the reader can read and understand

materials, but benefits from the guidance and instruction from a teacher, and frustration level is where a reader experiences extreme difficulty with reading and comprehension breaks down.

Ben and Juanita were tested at the beginning and end of the reading apprenticeship semester using the *CARP*. The *CARP* measures comprehension through retellings of narrative and expository text which are scored using a protocol.

On the pretest, Ben scored at the independent level on fifth grade narrative on two passages, one read orally and one read silently. He also scored independent level on the sixth grade narrative passage, but low instructional level on fifth grade expository and frustration level on sixth grade expository. On the posttest, Ben scored at the independent level on seventh grade narrative and eighth grade narrative, and instructional on seventh grade expository and eighth grade expository.

On the pretest, Juanita scored at the frustration level on a fourth grade narrative passage which she read silently. She scored independent on a fourth grade narrative which she read orally. She also scored independent level on fifth grade expository read orally and instructional on sixth grade expository which she also read orally. On the post test Juanita scored at the independent level on seventh grade narrative and eighth grade narrative, both read orally. She scored instructional on the seventh and eighth grade expository passages, both read orally.

Given the slow rate that characterized both Ben's and Juanita's reading, it surprised me that the construction of meaning did not seem to break down. Even on passages that were read with many corrections, hesitations, and repeated phrases, their

retellings were detailed and mostly sequential. Details that were forgotten were generally toward the beginnings of passages. Some of the expository passages were not retold sequentially, but details which occurred later in the passage were recalled first.

Measurement of comprehension could also be achieved from the results of objectives two through six on the state test. Table 2 shows a comparison of the results from the state test given to Ben and Juanita at the end of their seventh grade year, the school-wide benchmark test given during March of their eighth grade year before we focused on test-taking strategies during the reading apprenticeship, and the state test given at the end of their eighth grade year.

The scores on the table for each of the objectives on the test indicate the number of correct responses given out of the number of possible correct answers. The asterisk indicates mastery of that objective, based on the state standards. On the "total score" for the two state tests, the score is indicated by LI, which is the Learning Index. The Learning Index is an indicator which is used by the state to show one year's growth for each testing grade. The scale is not an actual percentage of correct answers, but runs within two to four points of the actual percentage correct. A Learning Index of 70 is required for a passing score.

Table 2

State Test Results for Ben			
*denotes mastery	Seventh Grade	Benchmark Test	Eighth Grade
Word Meaning	3 of 4*	4 of 4*	4 of 4*
Supporting Ideas	4 of 4*	3 of 4*	3 of 4*
Main Idea/Summary	3 of 8	2 of 8	5 of 8
Relationships/Outcomes	2 of 7	4 of 8	5 of 8
Inferences/Generalizations	9 of 15	5 of 16	14 of 16*
Point of View/Fact and Opinion	3 of 7	4 of 8	5 of 8
Total Score	24 of 45 / LI 58	22 of 48 / 48%	36 of 48 / LI 76*
State Test Results for Juanita			
Word Meaning	1 of 4	2 of 4	3 of 4*
Supporting Ideas	3 of 4	2 of 4	3 of 4*
Main Idea/Summary	2 of 8	3 of 8	7 of 8*
Relationships/Outcomes	3 of 7	3 of 8	8 of 8*
Inferences/Generalizations	9 of 15	10 of 16	14 of 16*
Point of View/Fact and Opinion	5 of 7*	7 of 8*	6 of 8*
Total Score	23 of 45 / LI 56	27 of 48 / 56%	41 of 48 / LI 85*

Objective two, supporting ideas, tests the ability to find details which are "right there" in the reading passage. Both Ben and Juanita had mastered that objective on the seventh grade test, and achieved mastery again on the eighth grade test. On all of the other objectives, both Juanita and Ben improved from the previous year. Ben achieved mastery on three of the six objectives, passing the test with a 76%. Juanita achieved mastery on all six objectives, passing the test with an 85%. Objectives three through six especially show improvement in the area of comprehension. These results will be discussed again in the results of question six because they were also impacted by the teaching and modeling of test-taking strategies.

Through the qualitative data collected from the reflective journals and

transcripts, and from viewing the videotapes, I noticed interactions that impacted comprehension. The dialogue that took place during the reading apprenticeship included teaching, modeling, and reinforcing comprehension strategies, as well as conversation about the books that Ben and Juanita were reading. These two types of dialogue served to reinforce comprehension of the text.

Comprehension was found to be a strength for both Ben and Juanita, especially during oral reading. Even when decoding was a problem for them, resulting in a lack of fluency, they were able to recall and retell details from the text and engage in conversation about the content. In my journal and in the transcripts of sessions, I noted times when comprehension was observed and reinforced:

"He seemed to enjoy the story and was able to retell sections." (Ben, session 2)

"I asked her to visualize the information as she was reading it to help with comprehension." (Juanita, session 3)

M - "Are you picturing that? What's going on here?" (Juanita, session 3)

M - "Hopefully, you're thinking to yourself that didn't make sense, so let me go back. That's a really good strategy to use." (Juanita, session 3)

"We discussed the information as we went along." (Juanita, session 3)

M - "Your best strength is understanding what you read." (Ben, session 4)

M - "You need to use your strength to help you read better. Like yesterday when you came across 'engine' and you said you didn't know the word. You got it immediately when I asked you what the driver would be starting. When you're reading and come across a word you don't know, think to

yourself what word would make sense there." (Ben, session 4)

"After we were through, I asked Ben to make a prediction. He predicted that the boys would be found." (Ben, session 5)

"Ben stopped and commented about why the boys were taking Troy off the stretcher instead of carrying him across the river in it. We talked about it, then Ben made a prediction about the river being too deep to get across easily. His prediction was right, and I commented about that when it happened in the story." (Ben, session 6)

"He stopped when he got confused and said, 'Huh?' I said, 'That didn't make sense, did it?' So we talked it through." (Ben, session 6)

"We discussed parts of the book as she read." (Juanita, session 7)

"I said, 'This is interesting, isn't it? What are they saying so far?'" (Juanita, session 7)

M - "You seem to be remembering what you read really well. Do you feel like you are understanding it all? J - "Yeah, I understand it." (Juanita, session 9)

"He then retold details from the first part of the chapter that he read last time." (Ben, session 9)

"She read the caption, and I said, 'I wonder why?' to model making predictions." (Juanita, session 11)

"I reminded her to use the meaning to help her figure out words. When she reread it, I said, 'That makes sense now, right?'" (Juanita, session 16)

M - "That reminds me of that movie where the man was frozen - "The Encino Man." Have you seen that?" (modeling connecting to another text)
(Juanita, session 16)

"At the end of the chapter, I asked Ben about what he thought was going to happen next. We talked about foreshadowing and how the author used it to prepare us as readers for the next chapter." (Ben, session 16)

M - "Can you picture that as you read it?" (Ben, session 16)

"I talked to Ben about the strategies that we have been using. I explained the 'think aloud' and pointed out when he and I have both used it. I suggested that he could do that when he is reading for his classes when it gets confusing." (Ben, session 18)

"I got confused at one point in the chapter, so I said, 'That confuses me,' and Ben turned back the page and showed me the part it was referring to which clarified it. So I knew he was following the story closely." (Ben, session 18)

M - "I wonder why that is true? The bogs preserve things thrown into them. What happens in the bog to cause that?" (Juanita, session 20)

"As she read this chapter, we stopped several times and discussed and commented on what she was reading. After the end, we enjoyed looking back through the pictures and talking about the captions." (Juanita, session 21)

"I suggested that she could ask herself if there is anything she already knows

about this to call up what she already knows to set a purpose for reading and to give her a hook to add information to." (Juanita, session 22)

"When she finished, she retold the story with 100% accuracy. She told it in her own words and added appropriate dialogue. She told it in sequence and in detail." (Juanita, session 22 on *CARP*)

Comprehension is dependent on the understanding of the words that are in the text. To improve comprehension, the building of conceptual vocabulary is a goal. The third research question of this study deals with vocabulary development.

Results of Question 3

How will a reading apprenticeship impact reading achievement in the area of vocabulary development? To answer this question, I define vocabulary development and how it can be measured, then describe the nature of the interactions in the reading apprenticeship that impacted vocabulary development.

Kenneth Goodman (1994) defines vocabulary development as a characteristic of a reader capable of making sense of a wide range of texts. He argues that:

It is a mistake to think that vocabulary-building exercises can produce improved comprehension. Language is learned in the context of its use. Word meanings are built in relationship to concepts; language facilitates learning, but it is the conceptual development that creates the need for the language. Without that, words are empty forms. So vocabulary is built in the course of language use, including reading (p. 1127).

Strategies for determining word meaning within a context were taught during

the reading apprenticeship. These strategies will be further discussed in the results of question five. The ability to use word meaning strategies could be measured qualitatively through the results of objective one, word meaning, on the state test. On the state test given during their seventh grade year, Ben correctly answered three out of four word meaning questions, showing mastery, and Juanita correctly answered one out of four word meaning questions, not showing mastery. On the state test given at the end of their eighth grade year at the end of the reading apprenticeship, Ben correctly answered all 4 word meaning questions, and Juanita correctly answered three out of four, both showing mastery of this objective (see Table 2 in "Results of Question 2").

Vocabulary development was impacted during the reading apprenticeship through the dialogue that took place about words in the meaningful context of reading. This dialogue usually resulted from a breakdown in comprehension because of a word not known, or an interruption in fluency because of the inability to recognize the word while attempting to decode. The journals and transcripts of sessions show evidence of vocabulary building:

M - "Do you know what a cache is?" B - "Kind of. Like a bank or something."

M - "Well, it's like a collection. You know on the internet, when you visit several web sites, your computer stores each site in the 'cache'. It's a collection of the sites you have visited so they can be reloaded easily. The cache in the story is a collection of leaves or berries that the boys gathered." (Ben, session 4)

"We talked about what cumulonimbus clouds were." (Juanita, session 1)

"She didn't know 'embalming', so we discussed it." (Juanita, session 7)

"She struggled with 'preserved' and didn't know the meaning." (Juanita, session 8)

"We talked about hieroglyphs, and I showed her the picture on page 18 to illustrate it." (Juanita, session 9)

"He struggled with 'mediocre'. He knew it had to be something that meant 'not hot,' but he couldn't figure it out. I supplied the word, then he recognized it." (Ben, session 9)

"She stopped at the word 'mourners' and asked what the word was. We stopped at the end of the sentence and discussed the concept of mourners and the hired mourners at the Egyptian funeral." (Juanita, session 10)

"She wanted to add 'sacrifices' to her word list. We talked about the meaning in this story, then she added it." (Juanita, session 10)

M - "Do you remember what a cache is?" B - "Yeah, I remember how they used it in the story, he had like a cache of leaves or berries, like a collection." (Ben, session 12)

"I asked him if he knew what an abyss was and he said sort of, but he wasn't sure. So, we talked about it for a few minutes." (Ben, session 15)

"She didn't know what the Alps were, so we talked about mountain ranges and climbing mountains, ski resorts, etc." (Juanita, session 16)

M - "Do you know what a glacier is?" J - "The thing in outer space." M - "No, it's a huge mountain of ice." J - Oh yeah, I think I saw that on T.V."

(Juanita, session 16)

M - "Seeped. Like creeping through. The lead from the lid of the can slowly seeped into the food. Usually you think of liquid as seeping." J - "Like leaking through." M - "Exactly." (Juanita, session 16)

"When she got to 'cumulonimbus', she said, 'Hey they said that in science this week! We were doing the weather and clouds and stuff, and he said cumulonimbus clouds.' I asked her if she remembered what they were, and she said, 'Yes, those stormy clouds shaped like an anvil.'" (Juanita, session 17)

"She didn't know the terms 'samurai' or 'Orientals', so we discussed them.

She also didn't know what parasites were, so we talked about that for a few minutes." (Juanita, session 19)

"I asked her if she remembered what 'samurai' meant, and she didn't. We looked back at it and talked about the Oriental warriors." (Juanita, session 20)

M - "Do you know what moss is?" J - "Those little things that look like butterflies?" M - Those are moths, m-o-t-h, moth. Moss is a plant that grows in real wet places. It's a tiny plant that usually will form over a rock or something and is real green. Sometimes it will grow over the trees. Like around a lake sometimes you see it growing over the trees and hanging down. That's moss." J- "Yeah, I think I remember that from science." (Juanita, session 20)

J - "One man was beheaded. That means his head was cut off, right?" (Juanita,

session 20)

The one-to-one environment of the reading apprenticeship allowed me, as the teacher, to immediately recognize when words were unfamiliar to Ben and Juanita as they were encountered, and to build their conceptual knowledge of the words within the context of their reading through dialogue.

Results of Question 4

How will a reading apprenticeship impact the self-perception of the reader? To answer this question, I define self-perception and how it can be measured, then describe the nature of the interactions in the two reading apprenticeship cases that impacted the self-perceptions of Ben and Juanita.

Self-perception of a reader is the opinion that a student has of his or her own ability to read well. Alm (1981) cautioned that students who perceive themselves as having poor ability in reading are the most likely to feel the most negative about themselves as readers. A student's self-perception of poor reading ability results in an expectation to not succeed which in turn causes the student to give up quickly (Wigfield & Asher, 1984). Self-perception can be measured by asking students about their feelings and opinions of themselves, but must be done in an environment of trust. Kos (1991) documented student comments that revealed their worry about facing ridicule, their feelings of discomfort while reading, and their concern about their ability to do daily tasks and future employment opportunities due to their reading difficulties.

During this reading apprenticeship, an environment of trust was established which allowed Ben and Juanita to openly discuss their self-perceptions as readers. Even

during the first session they seemed very comfortable answering the questions to the student questionnaire. Qualitative data used to answer this question include the student questionnaire given at the beginning and at the end of the reading apprenticeship, the questionnaire given the parents at the end, the questionnaire given the teachers at the end, and evidence coded "Student Attitude" from the journals and transcripts of the videotapes.

On the questionnaire given at the beginning of the semester, Juanita revealed that she did not think she was a good reader at all. She said she got very nervous when reading out loud because she couldn't say the words right. She said it was embarrassing to have to ask people what a word was or what a word meant. Juanita said, "When they call on me to read in class, I stutter and I can't read, so I just say, 'I don't want to read'."

Ben said that he felt like he was an "OK" reader, "not perfect, I'm OK." He said he gets very frustrated when reading and he has to pause to figure something out. He said that he didn't really mind being called on to read out loud in class because "I know I need the practice, but I don't really like it."

Juanita also expressed a frustration with not being able understand her school reading. She said, "If I don't do it my way, I don't do it at all. If they give me something I can't understand, then why read it anyway? If I know I'm not going to understand it, why read it at all?"

When asked what they remembered about reading in elementary, and when they first felt like they were having trouble with reading, Ben reported that he couldn't remember which grade, but he knew that "all the other kids could read really fast, and I

couldn't."

Juanita could remember that she was doing pretty well in reading until third or fourth grade when she remembered a boy making fun of her reading out loud. "I started crying and told my mom. Ever since then, my mom's been worried about my reading. He stood up in front of the class and said like, 'ha-ha you can't read'. I started crying and it really made me mad. When I first started reading, I was in the high group, until that day happened. So I stopped reading, and I would just say, 'I don't want to read'. So then they put me in the low group after that. So since that day, I don't like to read."

During the reading apprenticeships, evidence emerged concerning Ben and Juanita's attitudes toward reading and their perceptions of themselves as readers. Some of the observations related to their motivation to read or participate in a task:

"She was nervous in front of the camera, but soon forgot it was there. She answered the questions with no reserve and seemed to enjoy talking with me." (Juanita, session 1)

"We got out the dry erase markers and wrote 'ought' on the table. He said, 'cool!' (Ben, session 4)

"I asked Ben if he wanted me to finish that page, and he said, 'No, I'll do it.' He seemed eager to get on with the story." (Ben, session 6)

"She seemed really interested in using the electronic speller." (Juanita, session 6)

"She said it didn't matter which part she read over again, because she liked the whole book." (Juanita, session 6)

"Ben seemed very hesitant to do this activity. After he was finished, I

commented, 'It seemed that you didn't like doing that. Do you not like to write, or were you just not up to it today?' He smiled and stretched and said, 'I don't like to write.'" (Ben, session 7)

"Ben brought an unfinished essay from his English class he wanted to finish.

Since he did not want to write last time, I decided to start right away with this activity. He verbalized as he wrote and seemed eager to write a good essay. He wasn't as reluctant to write as last session." (Ben, session 8)

"I suggested going back to the first book for familiar reading, and Ben

commented that the book wasn't as good as he first thought it would be.

He said he liked this book better (*Danger Zone*) because it is 'juicier'. I

said, 'because it is longer and has more room for description?' He said,

'Yeah, the chapters are longer, like you said, meatier.'" (Ben, session 9)

"She seemed to enjoy rereading the page, laughing when she miscued the same

word more than once. She said, 'I want to try it one more time.'" (Juanita, session 9)

"She kept looking for words from the book to put into the speller. I think she

really likes typing in the words and reading them!" (Juanita, session 9)

"I asked, 'Are you still enjoying this book?' She said, 'Yeah, I like it. My mom is

like, what are you reading? I'm reading a mummy book. She goes, 'ah.' I

said, 'Did you tell her it's not a story but an informational book?' She

said 'Yeah, I told her they pull the organs out of their nose is all I told

her. She was like, I'm eating here!' We laughed." (Juanita, session 10)

"She enjoyed checking her answers with the continuity tester." (Juanita, session 12)

"She told her cousin who was visiting her, 'This is an awesome book!'" (Juanita, session 12)

"We laughed together at a few funny parts. He read a lot before he asked me to read." (Ben, session 16)

"When it was time to go, I said so, but she kept reading. Then Juanita said, 'I was like I don't care, I want to read that to see what happens!' I said, 'Good for you, I'm glad you are so excited about the book.' She said, 'I like that book.' (Juanita, session 17)

"We were also having a book fair this week, and Ben and I spent one whole morning out at the book fair tables browsing through the books instead of having a session. Ben pointed out several books he had read and commented on how much he liked some of them. I said that I thought he liked reading more than he had indicated to me. He said he liked reading when it was a good book. I told him to pick out a book and I would buy it for him to thank him for participating in my study. He was very excited and said he couldn't decide. I said he didn't have to decide today, but to keep looking until he found one he wanted. Later, he picked out *Nightjohn* by Gary Paulsen. I told him that was great, because it was the same author as *Danger on Midnight River*. He said that he had read the book before and really liked it." (Ben, session 18)

"He said that most books start out slow, then get more exciting. He said that's probably why he doesn't like to read, because he gets bored in the slow part and never gets to the exciting part." (Ben, session 18)

"I asked him how he felt about what we have done this semester, and he said it was fun." (Ben, session 21)

"Next we talked about the mind map. I told her we wouldn't have time to finish it since we only have finals week left. She said, 'I wish we could finish it!' (Juanita, session 21)

Juanita seemed to be in a good mood every session, but Ben's motivation to participate seemed to be affected by his mood on various days. Several times I commented in my journal about this:

"Ben seemed really tired or in a bad mood when he came in. He was very reluctant." (Ben, session 11)

"Ben just sat there, looking bored. While I read page 29, Ben sat with a bored expression on his face." (Ben, session 11)

"He was in a good mood today, which seems to allow him to be much more willing to converse and to use reading strategies without getting frustrated as easily." (Ben, session 12)

"Ben looked really tired this morning. We talked a few minutes about how the week of testing would go. I tried to engage him in a little conversation to help him wake up!" (Ben, session 17)

Juanita verbalized expressions of pleasure when she felt successful during her

reading. Ben would smile and nod, but only a few times did he verbalize his pleasure with his success. The videotapes caught their feelings of success:

"She looked up as she finished the sentence and said, 'Ahh! I said it right!'

(Juanita, session 6)

"I asked Juanita if she had been reading in any of her classes. She commented,

'Yeah, I did.. and I read a whole paragraph.' I asked how she felt about that, and she said, 'I feel happy! I only messed up like one word!' I said, 'And nobody made fun of you.' She nodded, no, and I said, 'Good! I'm glad to hear that!'" (Juanita, session 8)

"When she wrote 'visible' correctly, she exclaimed, 'Cool!'" (Juanita, session 8)

"She had such a pleased look on her face." (Juanita, session 9)

"When she got to 'lavish', she pronounced it correctly, so I said, 'yay!' She smiled and said, 'I remembered it!'" (Juanita, session 10)

"Finishing the questions, Juanita got out the continuity tester and said 'I like this thing here!' As she lit up each answer, showing she got it correct, she smiled. She was really excited that she got the Juan Cortina question right." (Juanita, session 14)

"Juanita started telling me about reading in her history class out loud. She said, 'It was a whole class thing. I didn't get nervous or nothing! I didn't get embarrassed, I was just reading!' She was smiling real big, so I said, 'Good for you!'" (Juanita, session 17)

"When he read 'tsunami' correctly, he looked at me and said, 'right?' I said, 'uh

huh', and he exclaimed, 'Yes!' (Ben, session 20)

"He motioned with his arm back and forth, and said, 'Yes! I passed [the state test] and went up four grades!' He really went up three grade levels, but I didn't say anything since he was so excited and was feeling so successful." (Ben, session 20)

There were only two instances that I observed when Ben actually said anything about how he felt about himself as a reader. One was during the questionnaire, and the other was during session 21, when I asked him if he wanted to read one of the *CARP* passages silently. He commented, 'Uh, Uh, No, I'm not good.' referring to his ability to read silently. He also expressed a great deal of worry about the state test, saying, "I'm worried, really worried" after the Benchmark test. Juanita also expressed worry about the test and said she had tried really hard on the Benchmark test. She said, "When people are around me I can't focus on that. I see everybody finishing and I want to hurry and finish." I was able to arrange for Ben and Juanita to take the test in a small room with study carrels and they were both very pleased with that arrangement.

During the reading apprenticeship, I encouraged Ben and Juanita and praised their efforts to try to boost their self-perceptions:

M - "See, don't just say I don't know, because you do! It make take you a few seconds, but you can do it!" (Juanita, session 13)

"I encouraged him to take the time to work them out, and that he can do it. His thought processes and reasoning are good, and I told him so. I encouraged him to not give up, and to keep working on them and he will

be able to do it." (Ben, session 14)

"I pointed out to him that even though he made a 58 last year, he only needed seven more questions right to pass. He seemed pleased. I wanted to take off some of the pressure and help him feel more relaxed about the test."
(Ben, session 15)

"I praised her for doing so much better at decoding. I said, 'You are using your strategies, and you are getting them. You were not doing that at first. You are doing really well now!'" (Juanita, session 15)

"After he finished, I encouraged him to stick with it on the real test and to not give up. I told him I knew he could pass if he continued to use the strategies he has learned." (Ben, session 17)

M - "That took a lot of work, but you did it!" (Ben, session 20)

M - "You're saying those words so fast now, it seems easy for you. That's really good!" (Juanita, session 20)

Another factor in the reading apprenticeship that seemed to impact Ben and Juanita's motivation was the amount of choice they had in what we did each session. I gave them choices in which books to read, what order to do activities during the session, what sections to reread, whether to read aloud or silently, and which words to add to their electronic speller list. I also gave them the choice of when to read and when to have me read to them. When we started talking about the state test, I gave them the choice of testing location and environment. These choices were coded "Student Choice" on the transcripts and journals of the sessions.

At the end of the reading apprenticeship, another questionnaire was given to Ben and Juanita. I asked them to fill it out at home, hoping that they would spend more time and answer the questions more thoughtfully if they were alone. I was wrong about that, because the answers they gave on the ending questionnaire were very brief, I believe because they had to write them out rather than verbalize them in a conversation like they did at the beginning. When asked "Do you think you are a good reader?", Ben simply answered, "yes", while Juanita answered, "After Mrs. Author (misspelled) was helping me I feel like a good reader." When asked about how they felt about the sessions we did this semester, Ben answered, "It has been a very good experience for me." Juanita answered, "I feel good about reading and learned more." Another question asked, "Do you think you are getting to be a better reader? Why do you think that?" Ben's answer was, "Yes, because it is good practice." Juanita's answer was "Yes, because I can work the word out and then I get the word right."

I gave each of Ben's and Juanita's teachers a questionnaire at the end of the semester which asked their impression of the student's reading ability and if they noticed any change in attitude toward reading in class or in ability to read class materials over the second semester. Four of Juanita's teachers out of seven responded. Responses indicated that they had not noticed any change in her attitude, and that her absences were a great concern. Two teachers indicated that they were worried about her and felt she had issues that they couldn't deal with. Six out of eight of Ben's teachers responded, one left blank, with a note stating , "I do not wish to participate," and one indicating that he was a long term substitute and couldn't answer most of the questions.

Of the four that filled out the questionnaire, three noted that they felt that Ben had shown a change in attitude over the semester. One said he showed willingness to read aloud and to share stories he had written, and that he felt more control over his own learning and had progressed. Another commented that he talked about books he was reading and shared opinions. A third claimed that Ben's attitude had changed tremendously and that he seemed much more confident and happier. Several expressed that Ben still struggled with reading, but his oral vocabulary helped him, and he seemed to be improving with practice.

I also sent home a questionnaire for Ben and Juanita's mothers to fill out. Ben's mother filled it out herself and Ben brought it back to me. Juanita came to me with hers, having filled it out herself. She said her mother was out of town and that she read the questions to her over the phone and wrote down her answers. The first question asked if they had noticed any change in the student's attitude toward reading, toward school, or ability to read over this semester. Juanita's mother said that she noticed Juanita wanted to read more at home. Ben's mother said that Ben's interest had improved and she felt that his reading skills had improved, but his confidence level had not improved.

Results of Question 5

What reading strategies were directly or indirectly taught or modeled during the reading apprenticeship? This question is answered from journal and transcript data coded "Strategy taught", "Strategy modeled", and "Strategy reinforced". During the reading apprenticeship sessions, there were three categories of strategies taught and modeled, decoding strategies, comprehension strategies, and test-taking strategies.

Strategies were taught within the context of reading. Language prompts served as a scaffolding of thinking processes with the goal of promoting self-monitoring during reading.

Decoding strategies taught included using multiple cues to monitor reading. The use of graphic cues, phonemic cues, syntactic cues, and semantic cues were taught and modeled. Syllabication was also taught to assist Ben and Juanita in decoding longer and more difficult words.

Examples of dialogue prompts from the sessions show these strategies taught:

M - "Try to find the small words within the larger words." (Juanita, session 3)

M - "If you come to a short word you don't know, think about another word you do know that has the same ending." (Juanita, session 3)

M - "Would 'mecro' be a word? What other sound does 'i' make besides [the short sound]? J - "[long i sound] micro?" (Juanita session 3)

M - "Outside would make sense there, too, wouldn't it? You saw the 'd' though, and went, 'wait, outdoors'. You were using not only the meaning, but the letters in the word, too." (Juanita, session 3)

M - "When you come to a word you don't know, consciously think to yourself, 'what word would go there? What makes sense there?' That helps you to figure it out. Look at the beginning of the word to help you, too. Try that today." (Ben, session 4)

"I pointed out the good strategy he used in figuring out words. He told himself to 'go back, go back' when he got confused because he miscued. He is

also remembering to finish the sentence when he comes to a word he doesn't know and try to figure out what should go there." (Ben, session 5)

M - "When you come across a word you don't know, you've got several ways to figure it out. One is just to look at it and sound it out. You have to look at what the word looks like and what letters are there, and break it down like you were doing. Another way is to figure out what word would go there to make sense. You could read on past it, skipping the word, then figure out what would make sense there. Or, you can start the sentence over and try it again to see if the word fits there." (Juanita, session 10)

"She miscued 'practiced', saying 'proceeded'. When she finished the sentence, I asked her if the sentence made sense, and she said no. She immediately went back to the word 'practiced', so I knew she knew that's what was not making sense." (Juanita, session 11)

"I reminded her to use the meaning to help her figure out the words. When she reread it, I said, 'That makes sense now, right?'" (Juanita, session 16)

"When he finished the passage, I reminded him to use the meaning of the word to help him with words he has trouble with." (Ben, session 17)

From the word list on the pretest *CARP*, I noticed that both Juanita and Ben had trouble decoding isolated words. Ben scored frustration level on the sixth grade list and Juanita scored frustration level on both fifth and sixth grade lists. Both students' miscues mostly occurred in the middle of the word. They correctly decoded the beginning and

end of the words, but made a new word by miscuing the middle. For example, for *invitation*, Juanita said *invention*, for *polite* both students said *pilot*, for *consent*, Ben said *constant*, for *abrupt*, Ben said *abort* and Juanita said *ambunt* (no meaning). For *chaos*, Ben said *chose* and for *frothy* they both said *forty*. During reading from continuous text, however, as observed from their running records, both students self-corrected many of these miscues when they noticed the change in meaning. As a result of this observation, I focused most of the direct teaching of decoding on using semantic cues, which was their strength. I encouraged both of them to pay attention to the middle of the word when they had trouble decoding, but to let the meaning help them figure it out.

The second category of strategies taught was comprehension strategies. Ben and Juanita both had good comprehension, so I tried to reinforce the strategies they used and model strategies to sustain their comprehension. I often asked them to make predictions and to visualize what they were reading, and I modeled thinking aloud and asking questions as I read. I also encouraged them to make personal connections to the text. Observations from the journals and transcripts show some examples:

"I asked her to visualize the information as she was reading it to help with comprehension." (Juanita, session 3)

M - "What would you do?" B - "It depends on how fast the river was. If it was slow, I'd go back across." M- "Yeah, because that's probably the shortest way, and you wouldn't know what's on this side." B - Usually if it's slow, it's not that deep." (session 4)

"After we were through reading, I asked Ben to make a prediction." (Ben, session 5)

M - "I was just thinking about when he was talking about having to go out and tell someone about their loved one dying. He could have just let someone else do it, some other doctor. Can you imagine having to do that?" B - "Yeah, that would really be hard, like telling someone their son died." (Ben, session 12)

"I asked her to 'think aloud'." (Juanita, session 13)

"At the end of the chapter, I asked Ben about what he thought was going to happen next. We talked about foreshadowing and how the author used it to prepare us as readers for the next chapter. (Ben, session 16)

M - "Can you picture that as you read? When they talk about 'one spring day' it makes me feel good with the sunshine and spring air and I can see the white, puffy clouds."

"I commented several times, modeling "thinking aloud" as I read." (Ben, session 16)

"When she got confused at the second paragraph, she asked if she could read it over. I said, 'Sure, that's what you should do if it doesn't make sense.' (Juanita, session 17)

" I talked to Ben about the strategies we have been using. I named the 'think aloud' and pointed out when he and I have both used it. I suggested that he could do that when he is reading for his classes and it gets confusing."

(Ben, session 18)

"I commented that it's nice to go back to books you have read before, because you get different things from them each time you read. (Ben, session 19)

"I encouraged her to scan the chapter and pick out important information to record on the mind map. We discussed the process as she did it."

(Juanita, session 20)

The last category of strategies taught was test-taking strategies. The state test was very important to Ben and Juanita, and they both expressed worry about whether they would pass. I knew they were reading and comprehending well enough to pass, but I felt that they didn't have good test-taking skills, based on their scores from the school-wide benchmark test. As I thought of Gee's (1996) notion of identity kits for the way things are done in cultures, I began to think about test-taking as a way of doing things in our school culture. Based on the things they told me, the fears they expressed, and their scores on previous tests, including the benchmark test, these two students did not have the identity kit for test taking! I made a decision to include test taking strategies in our reading apprenticeship. I taught them test-taking strategies for each objective on the test. Test-taking strategies were taught and modeled using past released state test passages and questions as practice materials.

We focused on test-taking strategies during sessions eleven through seventeen for Ben, and eleven through eighteen for Juanita. These were the sessions immediately before the benchmark test, which was right before our spring break, and after spring break until the state test six weeks later. Juanita and Ben both wanted to continue to also

read in their books, so we spent approximately fifteen to twenty minutes of the session using practice test passages, and the rest on their books.

I used a systematic way of teaching the test-taking strategies. First, I supplied the students with highlighters. I instructed them to read the questions first and highlight key words that they might look for in the passage and that would help them remember the type of question it was, such as main idea, summary, or a specific detail from the passage. Next, I asked them to read the passage silently, or with a soft whisper-read and to highlight anything that reminded them of the questions they had read. I encouraged them to read the entire passage and to skip over words they didn't know as long as they could get the main ideas of the passage. If the unfamiliar words turned out to be important to a question, they could go back to it and spend time figuring it out. The test is not timed, but I didn't want them to get bogged down with decoding which can be discouraging and tiring.

Next, I asked the students to do the questions out loud and to think aloud as they figured out the answer. By doing this, I could ask them questions that would guide their thinking and reasoning, with the goal of internalizing the questions so that they are able to self-monitor during the test.

The strategy I taught or modeled for objective one, word meaning, was to go back and read the sentence that contained the word. Next, read each answer choice and ask yourself, "Does that make sense in the sentence?" If the answer is not clear, take each answer choice and plug it into the sentence, reading it in the sentence instead of the word. Choose the one that makes the most sense. If context clues are not clear,

another strategy was to ask, "Do I know the meaning of any part of that word?" or "Does this word remind me of any other word I know?" On one reading passage, the word that was asked was *unemotionally*. The context clues were very unclear, and Juanita was having trouble with finding the answer. I asked her to see if she knew any part of the word, and she said, "Oh, emotion is in there." She then went right to the correct answer choice, "without showing feelings".

Objective two was locating supporting details from the passage. Ben and Juanita had both mastered this objective previously, but I reinforced the strategy of going back to the passage to actually find the detail. We talked about the three types of questions and answers that can be on the test - "right there", "think and search", and "author and me", from the QAR strategy (Raphael, 1986). Word meaning and supporting detail questions are "right there" and the students were taught to go back to the passage to find them.

Objective three was main idea and summarization. These questions are "think and search" questions. Juanita and Ben were taught the strategy of reading the question and the answer choices, then after each answer choice asking themselves, "Is that what the whole thing (passage, paragraph, or section) was about?" By doing that, they could discriminate main idea answer choices from answer choices that offered only a detail from the passage. When the question asked for a best summary of the passage, I suggested that they ask themselves, "Is there something from the beginning, the middle and the end of the story?" Also, on this test format, all of the passages are divided into two columns on the page, with a solid line dividing the columns. I said they could verify

that the answer had something from "both sides of the line" which was an easy mnemonic to remind them it had to be from all parts of the story, not just the beginning or the end. The incorrect answer choices usually were statements from only one part of the story. Going back to the passage is important for this objective, and clues can also be found in the title and subtitles of sections.

The fourth objective was relationships and outcomes, and the questions usually asked a cause and effect relationship, or what would probably happen next after the end of the story. Some of the cause and effect questions are "right there" questions, so I encouraged Juanita and Ben to always go back to the passage to see if the story told them the cause or the effect. If it wasn't "right there", they would have to "think and search" for clues. We used the analogy of being a detective for objectives four, five and six, because the test-taker has to search for clues which are always in the passage. I pointed out key words such as *cause*, *effect*, *because*, *resulted in*, *then*, and *next* which signaled the cause and effect relationship in a sequence of events. I also suggested that they ask themselves questions as they read the answer choices, depending on how the question was worded, such as, "Is that what caused it?" or "Was that the effect?" or "What evidence is there that that might happen next?" I emphasized that no questions on the test are "on my own" answers, but always passage dependent.

The fifth objective was inferences and generalizations. These questions are the hardest questions and there are more of them on the test than any other type. They are "think and search" and "author and me" questions. Our dialogue about these questions was critical in their beginning to understand how to find the answers. We talked

extensively about each answer choice and how to reason whether it was incorrect or correct. We talked again about searching for clues in the passage, because these questions are passage dependent also. Clues are usually found in at least two, sometimes three or more places that have to be put together to see the evidence for the answer. Questions I asked with the goal of having them internalize for self-questioning included, "Where did it talk about that (topic in the question) in the passage so I can go find a clue?", "Where are the clues I can put together?", and "Where did they talk about that (topic in the answer choice) in the passage so I can see if it relates to the question?" By becoming a detective and looking for clues, Ben and Juanita were able to answer the questions with much more confidence.

The last objective was author's purpose and point of view, fact and opinion, and propaganda techniques. Questions that ask the author's purpose and point of view are "author and me" questions. I showed Ben and Juanita that clues for author's purpose can be found in the verbs of the answer choices, because they relate to the text structure that the author has used. We talked about text structures, such as persuasive, cause and effect, informational, and comparison. The answer choices use verb phrases such as "persuade, convince, show the difference, inform the reader, give the reader information, show what caused, and explain the effects of." By focusing on these verb phrases, Juanita and Ben could ask, "Is that what the author was doing in this whole passage?"

The fact and opinion questions were taught as a two-step process. The first step was to identify each answer choice as a fact statement or an opinion statement and to

cross out the ones that were irrelevant to the question. For example, cross out the facts if the question is asking for an opinion. Once the answer choices have been narrowed down to only opinions, for example, the second step was to go back to the passage and see which opinion statement was actually in the passage. The one that was in the passage would be the answer.

The propaganda technique questions were usually only on the passages that were in the format of an advertisement. The question I encouraged Juanita and Ben to ask themselves on these questions was, "What is the advertiser trying to get me to do or see?" and "What evidence or clue is there that the advertiser is trying to do that?" Again, the questions are passage dependent, and I encouraged them to be detectives and to look for the clues that are there.

During the reading apprenticeship sessions in which we worked on test-taking strategies, I taught the strategies, I reinforced them by reminding Juanita and Ben to use the strategies, and I promoted internalization of strategies by asking them each time what strategies they planned to use and asking them to "think aloud" as they worked through the questions. We also reviewed the strategies they used at the end of sessions.

Results of Question 6

What are the nature of the interactions that seem to be the most important in facilitating the learning during a reading apprenticeship? To answer this question, I examined the data from the journals and transcripts. As the data were coded, the nature of the interactions emerged. I noticed that the first interactions were when I directly taught or modeled a strategy to Ben or Juanita. As I noticed their lack of strategy use

because they miscued and were not able to self-correct, I decided which strategy would meet their immediate need and taught it. As I read to Ben and Juanita during sessions, I also modeled the use of strategies. I "thought aloud" so they could see the strategy in use. Also, when working with the state test passages, I taught test-taking strategies that I knew from previous experience would work for answering the questions. These interactions were coded "taught strategy" and "modeled strategy" on the data.

The next interactions I noticed were when I reinforced a strategy. When I saw them use a strategy I would point it out to them or when they encountered trouble, I would remind them to use the strategy they had been taught. These interactions I coded "reinforced strategy" on the data. This led to them using the strategy after being prompted. When they did this, I coded it "use of strategy prompted" on the data.

Ben and Juanita used strategies they already knew and also began to use the strategies I taught them. When they used a strategy without my prompting, I coded it "use of strategy unprompted" on the data. Most of these instances occurred after session nine. When I really realized that Ben and Juanita were internalizing the strategies is when I began to notice each of them using metacognitive comments, or "thinking aloud", while they read, without my prompting. Most of these comments began happening around session five.

From the data, I can show examples of a series of interactions that resulted in the internalization of a strategy. From the data set of Juanita's sessions, this sequence of events occurred:

Session 3 - "You can go back and get a running start. You think to yourself,

wait, that didn't make sense, let me go back, and you think about what meaning would go there." (taught strategy)

Session 8 - "Does 'radged' make sense? What else could that be?" (reinforced strategy)

Session 11 - "She explained how she had sounded it out, and I reminded her to consider the meaning, too, not just sounding it out." (reinforced strategy)

Session 11 - "I said, 'Let me read that sentence to you,' so I could model it and have it make sense to her. Then I said, 'It's OK to stop if you're not sure, just think about the meaning, what is it really saying here?' (model strategy)

Session 11 - "Then I said, Remember to use your meaning. Think about 'brightly,' and what would start with a d-e-c that would make sense there?" J - "decorated?" M- "yes!" (use of strategy prompted)

Session 16 - "She used her strategy of reading the rest of the sentence to figure out 'severe'. (use of strategy unprompted)

Session 20 - "When she got to 'strangled' she said, 'strangely' twice, then looked up at me. I didn't say anything, so she looked back down and said, 'strangled with a rope'. I asked her how she figured that out, and she said, 'The g-l-e-d at the end, plus it had rope.'" (use of strategy unprompted)

Session 20 - J - "It doesn't make sense to me, does it?" (metacognitive comment)

A similar sequence of events can be seen with test-taking strategies in the sessions with Ben:

Session 13 - "When he had picked the incorrect answer, I guided him to the passage for the evidence, and asked him questions to guide him to the correct answer. I modeled the thinking and reasoning that happens in picking the correct answer. I showed him how to examine each answer choice and eliminate them one at a time, instead of just picking one."
(taught strategy and modeled strategy)

Session 14 - "While he did the questions out loud, I asked him how he got his answers, so he showed me in the passage where the evidence was."
(reinforced strategy)

Session 14 - "On the main idea question, he had a very hard time getting this one. I reminded him to ask himself, 'Is that what the whole thing is about?' When he finished, he went back to that one and said, 'That one might be C'. When he checked the answers, he went to C before the one he had marked first, and it was correct. I told him it was OK to go back and double check his answers." (use of strategy prompted)

Session 16 - "Ben read the questions, then read the passage aloud. He talked through the questions. I did very little prompting on this passage. Ben practiced thinking aloud through the entire passage. I commented when he finished about how well he was using his strategies. (use of strategy unprompted, and metacognitive comments)

Summary of Results

Examination of the data provided both quantitative and qualitative evidence

which helped to answer the research questions. The primary data set was the set of videotapes from the sessions, a reflective journal by the researcher who was a participant observer in the role of teacher in the apprenticeship, transcripts from five sessions for each of the two students, state test results from the previous year, the school-wide benchmark test, and the current year, informal reading inventory results from the *Classroom Assessment of Reading Processes* (Swearingen & Allen, 1997), running records, and questionnaires from students, parents and teachers. The quantitative data helped to answer questions one through three, and the qualitative data helped to answer all six questions.

Evidence from running records, transcripts of sessions and the reflective journal was used to answer question one which concerned fluency. Evidence from the running records taken from the pretest and posttest of the *CARP* and from three sessions indicated that Juanita and Ben both improved in reading rate and in accuracy while moving up at least two grade levels in reading materials.

Through the qualitative data, evidence was shown that several factors influenced the fluency exhibited by Juanita and Ben, including their mood day to day, their stance, their interest in the material they were reading, the choices they had been given during the reading apprenticeship, and the temporary scaffolding of reading strategies. It was noticed that Ben and Juanita both improved their fluency as they began to internalize decoding strategies and as they began to read more expressively.

Question two, which concerned comprehension, was answered using quantitative data from the *CARP* and from the state test as well as qualitative data from

the journals and transcripts. The quantitative data showed an improvement in comprehension on both narrative and expository text for both Ben and Juanita as measured by the protocols on the *CARP*. They also improved on the objectives that measure comprehension on the state test. Interactions were noticed in the qualitative data that suggested two types of dialogue that served to reinforce comprehension of text during the reading apprenticeship. First was teaching, modeling and reinforcing comprehension, and second was having conversations about the content of the texts. The observations in the journals and transcripts showed times when comprehension strategies were taught, modeled, observed and reinforced.

Question three was concerning vocabulary development and was answered through quantitative data for objective one on the state test, and qualitative data from the transcripts and journals of the videotapes. The results of objective one, word meaning, on the state test showed that Ben and Juanita both showed improvement from the previous year and from the benchmark test to the current year test. They both mastered the objective on the current year test.

Qualitative data showed that dialogue took place about word meanings as the need arose during the context of reading. The journals and transcripts of sessions show evidence that vocabulary building for both Ben and Juanita occurred through this dialogue.

Question four concerned the self-perception of the reader. This question was answered with qualitative data from the student questionnaires, the teacher questionnaires, the parent questionnaires, and the transcripts and journals of the

videotapes. The student questionnaires from the beginning of the semester indicated that Juanita thought she was not a good reader at all, while Ben thought he was an OK reader, but not perfect.

Evidence was shown from the journals and transcripts that an atmosphere of trust was established during the reading apprenticeship because both students seemed comfortable answering the questions. Both Ben and Juanita seemed to become more comfortable and more confident in their reading ability as the sessions went on. They indicated that they enjoyed the activities, they expressed happiness and satisfaction when they felt success, and they liked the books they read.

Ben's mood changed frequently over the course of the sessions and it was noted that this seemed to affect his motivation to read and his ability to read fluently. Juanita was in a good mood all of the time and seemed to thoroughly enjoy the sessions. Juanita also expressed pleasure at having successful reading experiences in her school classes. Both students expressed worry over the state test and were relieved when they began to feel more confident in their test-taking abilities in the sessions right before the test.

The questionnaire that Ben and Juanita filled out at the end of the sessions indicated that they enjoyed the sessions and felt that they had improved in their reading ability. The questionnaires that the teachers filled out indicated that Ben showed more control of his own learning, was willing to read aloud in class, talked about books he read and shared his opinion. One response indicated that his attitude had changed tremendously, seeming more confident and happier. Juanita's teachers indicated that they saw no change in her attitude. Her absences were a concern for the teachers, and

they felt that Juanita's absences negatively affected her attitude and work in class.

The questionnaires that the parents filled out at the end of the reading apprenticeship indicated that Ben's interest in reading and his skill had improved, but his confidence level had not improved. Juanita's mother said that she noticed that Juanita wanted to read more at home.

Question five concerned an observation of what reading strategies were taught or modeled during the reading apprenticeship. This question was answered from journal and transcript data. It was found that three categories of strategies were taught and modeled, decoding strategies, comprehension strategies, and test-taking strategies. Evidence from the data showed dialogue prompts that indicated the strategies taught. Explanation and examples of language prompts were given for the test-taking strategies taught. Strategies were directly taught, modeled, reinforced, and internalization of strategies was promoted through dialogue and practice.

Question six concerned an exploration of the interactions that seemed to be the most important in facilitating the learning during the reading apprenticeship. As the data were coded, the nature of these interactions emerged. The interactions that seemed to be important in facilitating learning included the direct teaching and indirect modeling of strategies, the reinforcement of strategies, the use of strategies with prompting, and the use of strategies without prompting. This last interaction, along with the observation of the use of metacognitive comments by the student, showed evidence that the strategies were internalized by the student. The data indicated examples of each of these interactions in a sequence of events during the reading apprenticeship for both Ben and

Juanita.

This chapter discussed the results and findings for each of the six research questions. The final chapter will discuss the conclusions and implications of these results and findings, and recommendations for further research.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter begins with an introduction reviewing the purpose of the study, the design, the subjects, the research questions, and the data analysis. Following the introduction, the results are summarized. The summary of results is followed by a section on conclusions and implications, which elaborates on the researchers interpretation of the reasons which affected the results and the implications of the study. Implications are summarized at the conclusion of that section. The chapter concludes with suggestions for further research.

Introduction

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to explore the interactions that take place during a reading apprenticeship that facilitate the learning of reading strategies by adolescent students who are at the middle school level and are still at-risk for reading failure and to investigate how a reading apprenticeship affects reading achievement in the areas of fluency, vocabulary development, comprehension, and the self-perception of the reader.

The design of this study was a qualitative case study which was descriptive and interpretive in nature (Merriam, 1988). It included two cases which were investigated simultaneously. The units of analysis were two students, each one part of a one-to-one reading apprenticeship. The researcher served as participant observer in both cases and was the teacher in each of the reading apprenticeships. The two students were chosen

purposefully. The primary data set was qualitative in nature, and also included were elements of quantitative data.

Subjects were middle school students attending a middle school located in a suburb of a large metropolitan area in a southern state. The school served a population representing an ethnicity ratio of approximately 2.3% African-American, 8.4% Hispanic, 88.2% White, .7% Asian, and .4% Native American. 10% of the students were economically disadvantaged. One of the students in the study was of Hispanic ethnicity and the other was of mixed African-American and White ethnicity. Neither student qualified for Special Education services because of their Cognitive Ability Scores, which were 86 and 88. Each student participated with the researcher in a reading apprenticeship two days per week for approximately 45 minutes per session. Sessions included pretest and posttest measures using the *Classroom Assessment of Reading Processes* (Swearingen & Allen, 1997), reading from narrative or expository books, working with words, writing, and dialogue about the reading. Reading strategies were directly taught, modeled, and reinforced by the teacher/researcher with the goal of the students internalizing the strategies and improving their reading in the areas of fluency, vocabulary development, comprehension, as well as improving their attitudes toward reading and their self-perception about their reading ability.

During this study, I sought to answer the following questions regarding the facilitation of learning by adolescent students in the environment of a reading apprenticeship:

- 1) How will a reading apprenticeship impact reading achievement in the area of

fluency?

- 2) How will a reading apprenticeship impact reading achievement in the area of comprehension?
- 3) How will a reading apprenticeship impact reading achievement in the area of vocabulary development?
- 4) How will a reading apprenticeship impact the self-perception of the reader?
- 5) What reading strategies were directly or indirectly taught or modeled during the reading apprenticeship?
- 6) What are the nature of the interactions that seem to be the most important in facilitating the learning during a reading apprenticeship?

Data collection included videotapes of each session, transcriptions of five sessions for each student, a reflective journal on each session by the researcher, a pretest and posttest using the *Classroom Assessment of Reading Processes*, running records taken from reading segments during sessions, state test results, student interviews and questionnaires, parent questionnaires, and teacher questionnaires. Data was analyzed according to procedures recommended in Merriam (1988) and Gall, Borg and Gall (1996) for qualitative data. The quantitative data was reported as a comparison chart for pretest and posttest scores for each case as additional evidence for the answers to the research questions. The qualitative data were reported as narrative description. The following section summarizes both quantitative and qualitative results.

Results

Evidence from running records, transcripts of sessions and my reflective journal

was used to answer question one which concerned fluency. Evidence from the running records taken from the pretest and posttest of the *CARP* and from three sessions indicated that Juanita and Ben both improved in reading rate and in accuracy while moving up at least two grade levels in reading materials.

Through the qualitative data, evidence was shown that several factors influenced the fluency exhibited by Juanita and Ben, including their mood day to day, their interest in the material they were reading, the choices they had given to them during the reading apprenticeship, and the temporary scaffolding of reading strategies. It was noticed that Ben and Juanita both improved their fluency as they began to internalize decoding strategies and as they began to read more expressively.

Question two, which concerned comprehension, was answered using quantitative data from the *CARP* and from the state test as well as qualitative data from the journals and transcripts. The quantitative data showed an improvement in comprehension on both narrative and expository text for both Ben and Juanita as measured by the protocols on the *CARP*. They also improved on the objectives that measure comprehension on the state test. Interactions were noticed in the qualitative data that suggested two types of dialogue that served to reinforce comprehension of text during the reading apprenticeship. First was teaching, modeling and reinforcing comprehension, and second was having conversations about the content of the texts. The observations in the journals and transcripts showed times when comprehension strategies were taught, modeled, observed and reinforced.

Question three was concerning vocabulary development and was answered

through quantitative data for objective one on the state test, and qualitative data from the transcripts and journals of the videotapes. The results of objective one, word meaning, on the state test showed that Ben and Juanita both showed improvement from the previous year and from the benchmark test to the current year test. They both mastered the objective on the current year test.

Qualitative data showed that dialogue took place about word meanings as the need arose during the context of reading. The journals and transcripts of sessions show evidence that vocabulary building for both Ben and Juanita occurred through this dialogue.

Question four concerned the self-perception of the reader. This question was answered with qualitative data from the student questionnaires, the teacher questionnaires, the parent questionnaires, and the transcripts and journals of the videotapes. The student questionnaires from the beginning of the semester indicated that Juanita thought she was not a good reader at all, while Ben thought he was an OK reader, but not perfect.

Evidence was shown from the journals and transcripts that an atmosphere of trust was established during the reading apprenticeship because both students seemed comfortable answering the questions. Both Ben and Juanita seemed to become more comfortable and more confident in their reading ability as the sessions went on. They indicated that they enjoyed the activities, they expressed happiness and satisfaction when they felt success, and they liked the books they read.

Ben's mood changed frequently over the course of the sessions and it was noted

that this seemed to affect his motivation to read and his ability to read fluently. Juanita was in a good mood all of the time and seemed to thoroughly enjoy the sessions. Juanita also expressed pleasure twice at having successful reading experiences in her school classes. Both students expressed worry over the state test and were relieved when they began to feel more confident in their test-taking abilities in the sessions right before the test.

The questionnaire that Ben and Juanita filled out at the end of the sessions indicated that they enjoyed the sessions and felt that they had improved in their reading ability. The questionnaires that the teachers filled out indicated that Ben showed more control of his own learning, was willing to read aloud in class, talked about books he read and shared his opinion. One response indicated that his attitude had changed tremendously, seeming more confident and happier. Juanita's teachers indicated that they saw no change in her attitude. Her absences were a concern, and they felt that negatively affected her attitude and work in class.

The questionnaires that the parents filled out at the end of the reading apprenticeship indicated that Ben's interest in reading and his skill had improved, but his confidence level had not improved. Juanita's mother said that she noticed that she wanted to read more at home.

Question five concerned an observation of what reading strategies were taught or modeled during the reading apprenticeship. This question was answered from journal and transcript data. It was found that three categories of strategies were taught and modeled, decoding strategies, comprehension strategies, and test-taking strategies.

Evidence from the data showed dialogue prompts that indicated the strategies taught. Explanation and examples of language prompts were given for the test-taking strategies taught. Strategies were directly taught, modeled, reinforced, and internalization of strategies was promoted through dialogue and practice.

Question six concerned an exploration of the interactions that seemed to be the most important in facilitating the learning during the reading apprenticeship. As the data were coded, the nature of these interactions emerged. The interactions that seemed to be important in facilitating learning included the direct teaching and indirect modeling of strategies, the reinforcement of strategies, the use of strategies with prompting, and the use of strategies without prompting. This last interaction, along with the observation of the use of metacognitive comments by the student, showed evidence that the strategies were internalized by the student. The data indicated examples of each of these interactions in a sequence of events during the reading apprenticeship for both Ben and Juanita. The next section is interpretive in nature (Merriam, 1988) and describes the conclusions of the researcher, indicates possible reasons for the effects described in the previous section.

Conclusions and Implications

This section is divided into three sections representing the researcher's interpretation of the elements that impacted the facilitation of learning by the students in the environment of the reading apprenticeship. These elements were environment, dialogue, and strategy instruction. Following this section, recommendations for further research will be discussed.

Environment

The environment of the reading apprenticeship was a dyadic social context. Sociocultural theory indicates that learning happens only in a social context and Vygotsky (1978) viewed intelligence as being shaped by social rather than solely by innate forces. Gee (1996) suggested that literacy is deeply related to social practices and cannot be separated from them. Phillips and Soltis (1998) concur that learning occurs effectively in situations in which the student is located and actively engaged. The reading apprenticeship provided such an environment. It was a dyadic social situation in which the students could be actively engaged and learning, therefore, could occur.

Lave (1996) asserted that the informal practices through which learning occurs in apprenticeship are "powerful and robust" (p. 150). The reading apprenticeship in this study was not designed to have a specific step-by-step agenda, but to be an informal situation in which the teaching and learning situations were influenced by the needs and desires of the student and the instructional decisions of the trained reading specialist. The apprenticeship model allowed for the dyadic relationship through which learning could take place within the student's zone of proximal development.

Alm (1981) described poor classroom atmosphere, difficult and dull reading materials, and poor teaching practices that overemphasized skills as an aspect of students' educational histories that contribute to reading failure. The reading apprenticeship in this study was established in an environment of trust, allowed for student choice in materials, and incorporated research based teaching practices which were chosen in direct relation to the needs of the students. I believe that in contrast to

Kos' (1991) observation of students who felt that their instructional experiences were irrelevant and distanced them from ownership of their own learning processes, this reading apprenticeship encouraged relevant experiences and development of the students' ownership of their own learning processes. The reading apprenticeship did not focus on subskills, as Allington (1994) warned against, but incorporated high expectations for literacy learning through real reading experiences which helped to develop effective strategy use.

Alm (1981) also cautioned that students who perceive themselves as having poor ability in reading are the most likely to feel the most negative about themselves as readers. The reading apprenticeship allowed for close scrutiny of negative feelings, and multiple opportunities for me to encourage and praise their efforts. In contrast to a regular classroom atmosphere where students often feel just part of the crowd, the one-to-one arrangement in the reading apprenticeship permitted the students to enjoy total attention from the teacher. Most people believe that adolescents do not like personal attention; however, I have found that they indeed do not like it when it is in front of their peers, but they thoroughly enjoy it when they are one-to-one. Both students in this study reacted very positively to one-to-one attention and perceived that they were fortunate to be getting "extra help with their reading." Alm (1981) stated that the attitude of the student in any learning situation is of critical importance, and I believe that aspects of the reading apprenticeship contributed to a positive attitude in the students.

One aspect that contributed to a positive attitude was the choice that students

had. I gave them choices in which books to read, what order to do activities during the session, what sections to reread, whether to read aloud or silently, and which words to add to their electronic speller list. I also gave them the choice of when to read and when to have me read to them. When we started talking about the state test, I gave them the choice of testing location and environment. These choices may have contributed to the students' feeling that they had ownership of the learning that was taking place.

Another aspect that contributed to a positive attitude was the reduction in stress that the students felt toward reading. The atmosphere of the reading apprenticeship was one of trust and the students knew they would not be ridiculed or chastised for taking risks in their reading. Juanita's comments about not wanting to do anything in reading if she knew it would be wrong anyway, gave way to her taking continual risks in the reading apprenticeship environment. Ben's moodiness was apparent during a few sessions of the reading apprenticeship, but through conversation and the attention I was able to give him, his bad mood usually turned into a good mood by the end of the session. Ben's mother was concerned that I would be sensitive to his frustrations, and the environment of the reading apprenticeship made that an easy task.

Through conversations with Ben and Juanita's teachers, I knew that their behavior in our sessions was much better than their behavior in classes. They felt comfortable in the reading apprenticeship environment and poor behaviors were not necessary to gain attention. The absence of their peers contributed to their ability to focus on their own learning. Their motivation, as Ruddell and Unrau (1994) describe, seemed to be based on intrinsic motivation which included satisfaction with their

achievement, reinforcement of their self-worth, and the expectation of reading enjoyment. Ben and Juanita were free to express their worries about their ability to read and their ability to pass the state test. Their worries subsided as their concerns were directly addressed in the reading apprenticeship, and they felt more confident as they saw their own progress.

In summary, I believe that the environment of the reading apprenticeship served to positively impact reading achievement for Ben and Juanita in the areas of fluency, comprehension, and vocabulary. I also believe that the environment positively impacted the self-perception of reading ability in Ben and Juanita.

Dialogue

Another element that impacted the facilitation of learning by the students in the environment of the reading apprenticeship was the dialogue that took place. Vygotsky (1978) believed that language is the tool that mediates learning. Bakhtin also believed that true understanding is dialogic in nature (Wertsch, 1991). Dialogue in the reading apprenticeship was critical to the construction of knowledge and the mediating of understanding by the students. My work within the students' zone of proximal development as the more knowledgeable other in these dyadic relationships was key to learning taking place.

Rosenblatt (1994) purported that "The teaching of reading and writing at any developmental level should have as its first concern the creation of environments and activities in which students are motivated and encouraged to draw on their own resources to make 'live' meanings" (p. 1082). The dialogue during the reading

apprenticeship helped to accomplish this goal. Conversations about the books that Ben and Juanita were reading occurred naturally as we read together. We enjoyed the content of the books as we made predictions, compared the content to real life, and in the case of the informational books, we wondered together about the incredible information we read. The students were free to dialogue at any time about what they were thinking, questions they had, comments they wanted to make, and confusions they needed to clear up, in contrast to a classroom where this dialogue would be much more controlled or nonexistent.

The difference in dialogue in a regular classroom and in a reading apprenticeship is the dyadic relationship of the dialogue. In a regular classroom, the dialogue (or usually monologue) of the teacher is usually directed to a group, rather than an individual. I believe that most students, especially those who feel marginalized in the classroom, regard this dialogue as being directed to everyone else, not to themselves. The dialogue is therefore tuned out by these students and becomes a monologue rather than a dialogue. In the reading apprenticeship, all conversation is a dialogue. Students tune in because they are actively engaged in the dialogue. They know that they are a part of the conversation and they respond and take risks that they would not take in a classroom.

The dialogue in the reading apprenticeship contributed to the students construction of knowledge as they read. Rosenblatt explains that "we make sense of a new situation or transaction and make new meanings by applying, reorganizing, revising, or extending public and private elements selected from our personal linguistic-

experiential reservoirs" (p. 1061) Instead of the students' conceptual and experiential background limiting their ability to comprehend the text, as Goodman (1994) said, the conversations that took place in the reading apprenticeship served to call up and build prior knowledge and enabled the transaction to be more meaningful. When the personal linguistic-experiential reservoirs of the students did not contain enough information to construct knowledge, we were able to recognize it and build that schema immediately. In the context of the reading apprenticeship, a more meaningful transaction could take place between the reader and the text with the scaffolding of our dialogue.

Vocabulary development was impacted during the reading apprenticeship through the dialogue that took place about words in the meaningful context of reading. This dialogue usually resulted from a breakdown in comprehension because of a word not known, or an interruption in fluency because of the inability to recognize the word while attempting to decode. The one-to-one environment of the reading apprenticeship allowed me, as the teacher, to immediately recognize when words were unfamiliar to Ben and Juanita as they were encountered, and to build their conceptual knowledge of the words within the context of their reading through dialogue.

During the reading apprenticeship, I encouraged Ben and Juanita and praised their efforts to try to boost their self-perceptions. They also felt free to verbalize their worries, frustrations, and negative feelings about reading. These dialogues enabled us to clarify the reasons for their feelings and to encourage them to have a more positive self-perception regarding their reading abilities.

In summary, I believe that the dialogue that took place during the reading

apprenticeship served to positively impact reading achievement for Ben and Juanita in the areas of fluency, comprehension, and vocabulary. I also believe that the dialogue positively impacted the self-perception of reading ability in Ben and Juanita.

Strategy Instruction

In addition to conversations about the books the students were reading, dialogue enabled me to recognize the lack of reading strategy use and to teach, model, and reinforce good reading strategies. Ruddell and Unrau (1994) claim that "knowledge of teaching strategies is critical to the teacher's instructional decision making" (p. 1026) and that an important part of that strategy knowledge resides in understanding and using informal observations and assessments of the reader during instruction which provides immediate feedback to the reader as well as insight into the reader's meaning-construction process that can be used to plan follow-up instruction. In the most successful tutoring programs, the teacher is a trained, certified teacher (Clay, 1993; Madden, Slavin, Wasik & Dolan, 1997). My own training as a reading specialist gave me the knowledge and experience to be able to recognize the lack of strategy use, to teach, model, and reinforce good reading strategies through the dialogue that we engaged in.

Rather than slowing instruction down and making it more concrete, remedial instruction is more effective when it is intensive and accelerated (Allington, 1994). The reading apprenticeship allowed learning to be facilitated through the assistance of the more knowledgeable other, mediating understanding of the reading process and the use of reading strategies by the student. These students were able to develop the identity kit

of a strategic reader and a test-taker through the internalization of strategies.

As in Kos' (1991) study, the two students in this study exhibited inconsistent and inefficient use of reading strategies. They did not show proficiency at self-monitoring their reading. Through the reading apprenticeship, effective strategies were taught, modeled, and reinforced and students began to use the strategies with prompting and eventually without prompting. The result was an increase in fluency for both students and an increase in comprehension while reading materials at higher levels of difficulty.

Three categories of strategies were taught, modeled and reinforced during the reading apprenticeship: decoding strategies, comprehension strategies, and test-taking strategies. At the same time, vocabulary building was taking place through the dialogue that occurred when unfamiliar words were encountered during reading.

My observation was that fluency was impacted during the reading apprenticeship through the interactions that took place as well as the amount of practice with quantities of text that both students received. We know that reading improves the more we read, and the reading apprenticeship afforded opportunities for a great deal of practice. In addition, the dialogue which occurred during the reading apprenticeship reinforced the strategies needed for fluent reading. I believe that fluency was impacted in a positive way through the reading apprenticeship. The interactions that most effectively impacted fluency were the quantity of reading practice afforded the students, the teaching and modeling of decoding strategies which improved word recognition, and the encouragement and modeling of expressive reading.

I believe also that comprehension was impacted in a positive way during the

reading apprenticeship. The dialogue that took place during the reading apprenticeship included teaching, modeling, and reinforcing comprehension strategies, as well as conversation about the books that Ben and Juanita were reading. These two types of dialogue served to reinforce comprehension of the text.

The interactions that seemed to be the most important in facilitating the learning during the reading apprenticeship was the sequence of teaching and modeling a strategy, reinforcing the strategy, prompting the use of the strategy followed by the student using the strategy, then the student using the strategy without being prompted. At that point, I concluded that the strategy had been internalized. Metacognitive comments by the student while reading which led to strategy use also indicated that the strategy had been internalized.

In summary, I believe that the strategy instruction that took place during the reading apprenticeship served to positively impact reading achievement for Ben and Juanita in the areas of fluency, comprehension, and vocabulary. I also believe that the strategy instruction positively impacted the self-perception of reading ability in Ben and Juanita as they began to see success through their internalization of reading strategies. The test-taking strategies that Ben and Juanita learned resulted in passing scores on the state test, which in turn had a major effect on their self-perception as readers.

Summary of Implications

The above section of conclusions and implications provided my interpretation of the results found from the quantitative and qualitative data collected during this case study. The following summary restates implications based on these conclusions:

1. A reading apprenticeship is an effective one-to-one intervention model for use with adolescent students who are at the middle school level and are still at risk for reading failure.

2. The environment of a reading apprenticeship with adolescent students should be one of trust in which the student can be actively engaged and willing to take risks.

3. The reading apprenticeship should not have a specific step-by-step agenda, but should be an informal situation in which the teaching and learning is influenced by the needs and choices of the student and the instructional decisions of a trained reading specialist.

4. Informal assessment should occur within the reading apprenticeship to determine the student's zone of proximal development, and the instructional decisions by the teacher should reflect the scaffolding necessary to accelerate student learning.

5. A critical piece of the reading apprenticeship is dialogue. The dialogue between student and teacher in the reading apprenticeship should facilitate the learning of reading strategies, build conceptual and experiential schemata to increase vocabulary knowledge, and give insight into the reading behaviors of the student. Dialogue should also serve to encourage the student and to positively influence the self-perception and motivation of the reader.

6. Reading strategies should be directly taught, modeled, and reinforced with the goal of the student internalizing the strategies to the extent that they are used without prompting. Decisions regarding which reading strategies to teach should be made by the teacher who is knowledgeable in strategy instruction and should be based on the

individual needs of the student. These needs should be discovered through informal assessment, dialogue, and observation of the student reading authentic text. Strategies could include decoding strategies, comprehension strategies, and test-taking strategies.

7. The reading apprenticeship sessions should include a significant amount of time devoted to reading. Reading should be done by the student to improve fluency and comprehension and by the teacher to model fluent reading and opportunities for dialogue.

Recommendations for Further Study

This study addressed the issue of apprenticing adolescents who are at risk for reading failure into the community of readers who value reading as a tool for learning, communicating, and enjoyment. This study was a case study of two eighth grade students who participated in a reading apprenticeship for one semester. The data collected served to show that the reading apprenticeship was an effective way to provide scaffolded reading experiences for students which resulted in gains in reading fluency, comprehension, and vocabulary building. It also had a positive effect on the self-perception of the readers.

Further study needs to be done to answer questions regarding effective ways to ensure that middle school students enter high school with grade level reading ability. Exact replication of this study would be impossible; however, reading apprenticeships could be done following the general recommendations in this study to determine what other interactions facilitate learning in a reading apprenticeship and to determine if additional evidence shows that the sequence of teaching, modeling, and reinforcing a

strategy results in the use of the strategy with prompting and eventually without prompting. It would also be important to discover what additional strategies can be taught, modeled, and reinforced which would facilitate gains in reading achievement in the areas of fluency, comprehension, and vocabulary building.

This study was done with eighth graders. It would be interesting to see if the same type of reading apprenticeship would be effective with high school students or adults who are struggling with reading. It would also be important to explore reading apprenticeships with younger students at each grade to see if grade level reading ability could be achieved earlier for those who are falling behind. Then it would also be important to see if the gain achieved in the reading apprenticeship is maintained throughout the school years by doing follow-up studies on students who have participated in reading apprenticeships.

This study did not investigate whether the gains made in the reading apprenticeship carried over into the regular classes of the students, other than through the data collected in the teacher questionnaires. Documenting the use of strategies in regular classroom reading materials and the effect on achievement in content areas would be of additional interest.

This study described a reading apprenticeship which positively impacted reading achievement for two students in the areas of fluency, comprehension, and vocabulary development, as well as influencing their motivation for reading and their self-perceptions as readers. The environment of the reading apprenticeship, the dialogue that occurred throughout the reading apprenticeship, and strategy instruction, modeling, and

reinforcement were found to be factors and interactions which facilitated learning during this intervention. For these two students the reading apprenticeship provided an opportunity to accelerate learning and instilled the motivation to continue to become better readers.

Vacca (1998) warns the reading community to not marginalize adolescent literacy at a time when the literacy development of early adolescents and teenagers is more critical than ever. We must continue to search for effective ways of developing adolescent literacy and ensuring that every student has the opportunity to be apprenticed into the community of readers who value reading as a tool for learning, communicating, and enjoyment.

APPENDIX A
PERMISSIONS FOR CONDUCTING RESEARCH



University of North Texas
Sponsored Projects Administration

NOV - 1 1998

November 23, 1998

Mary L. Arthur

Re: Human Subjects Application No. 98-225

Dear Ms. Arthur:

As permitted by federal law and regulations governing the use of human subjects in research projects (45 CFR 46), I have conducted an expedited review of your proposed project titled "The Effects of A One-On One Intervention Model on The Attitudes and Reading Achievement of At-Risk Middle School Readers." The risks inherent in this research are minimal, and the potential benefits to the subjects outweigh those risks. The submitted protocol and informed consent form is hereby approved for use of human subjects on this project.

The UNT IRB must re-review this project prior to any modifications you make in the approved project. Please contact me if you wish to make such changes or need additional information.

If you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Sandra L. Torrell, Chair
Institutional Review Board

ST:ab

cc: IRB Members

PO Box 161240 • Denton, Texas 76203-1240
(817) 565-1440 • Fax (817) 565-4717 • TDD (800) 735-2989
e mail: torrell@planet.unt.edu

Recognized for Excellence



October, 1998

To Whom it May Concern:

Mary L. Arthur has permission from Independent School District to conduct her dissertation study at Middle School. It is understood that she will be conducting one-on-one sessions with four students before and after school for the entire second semester, with the goal of improving reading attitudes and achievement. It is also understood that confidentiality will be maintained regarding names of the students and Independent School District in any and all publications and presentations that may result from this study.

Assistant Superintendent for Instruction

Date

To the parent of _____,

I am planning to conduct a research project for my Doctoral dissertation at University of North Texas this spring. I request permission for your student to participate in this study. The study will be a case study of four students participating in a one-to-one intervention in the area of Reading for 45 minutes, two times per week, for eighteen weeks. The study will begin January 6, 1999, at the beginning of the fourth six weeks period and will continue through May 21, the end of the sixth six weeks period. The sessions will occur in the xxxx Middle School library or adjoining classroom, before school, from 7:00 a.m. to 7:45 a.m., or after school, from 3:15 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. on Monday and Wednesday, or on Tuesday and Thursday. The goals of the study are to determine the effect of a one-to-one intervention on the reading achievement and attitudes toward reading of middle school students who are currently having difficulty in the area of reading. All data collected will be confidential, and your child's name, the name of the school, and the district will not be used in any publication or presentation of the results of the study. Data collected may include standardized test scores already existing in school records, informal reading inventories, interviews with the student and the parent, student work produced during the sessions, video and/or audio tapes of sessions, and field notes and journals produced by the researcher. I will be conducting the one-to-one sessions with your child myself and will be using research based strategies that have been shown to be effective with other age groups of children. It is important in the field of education that we determine effective instructional practices for adolescents in the area of reading. It is expected that your child will benefit from participating by improving in reading achievement and in attitude toward reading.

Your decision whether or not to allow your child to participate will in no way affect your child's standing or grades in his/her classes at school. You have the freedom

to discontinue your child from the study at any time. At the conclusion of the study, a summary of the results will be made available to you. Should you have any questions or desire further information, please call me at xxxx. Thank you in advance for your cooperation and support. Please sign the attached statement and return to xxxx Middle School as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

Mary L. Arthur, Reading Specialist, xxxx Middle School

THIS PROJECT HAS BEEN REVIEWED BY UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS
COMMITTEE FOR THE PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS (PHONE 940-565-
3940)

Please indicate whether or not you wish to have your child participate in this project by checking a statement below and returning this page to xxxx Middle School as soon as possible.

___ I do grant permission for my child, _____ to participate
in the case study for the Doctoral dissertation of Mary L. Arthur.

___ I do not grant permission for my child _____ to
participate in this project.

Parent/Guardian's signature_____

Date_____

To _____,

I am planning to conduct a research project for my Doctoral dissertation at the University of North Texas this spring. I would like for you to participate in this study. The study will be a case study of four students participating in a one-to-one reading session with me, twice a week, for the entire spring semester. We would meet before or after school on Monday and Wednesday, or on Tuesday and Thursday for about 45 minutes. Your name and the name of the school will not be used in the final report or any presentation of my study to the public. No one will know that you are participating in this study unless you choose to tell them. I will be looking at your school records for past test scores and you will participate in informal reading inventories during the sessions. I will be videotaping all of the sessions in order to have accurate records of what takes place and to see your growth as a reader. These tapes will be seen by one one except you, me, and my professors, unless I get permission from you.

Your participation in this study is strictly voluntary, and you may withdraw from the study at any time without it affecting you at all. Your participation in this study will not affect your grades at school. I will share with you the results of the study at the end of the semester. You may feel free to ask me any questions about the study at any time. I appreciate your participation in this very important study to examine ways of helping middle school students in reading.

Sincerely,

Mary L. Arthur, Reading Specialist, xxxxx Middle School

Please sign below if you agree to participate:

____I agree to participate in this project and to make every effort to be present for each

session. I understand that this is a research project and my attendance and active participation is important to the study and to my improvement in reading.

Student signature_____

Date _____

APPENDIX B
STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRES

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE - BEGINNING OF SEMESTER

What does it take to be a good reader?

Do you think you are a good reader?

When you are reading and you come to something you don't know, what do you do?

What is the hardest thing about reading?

What would you like to do better as a reader?

Who in your family likes to spend time reading?

What is your favorite thing to do outside of school?

What do you think you do best?

What do you think you want your career to be?

Why would you like to read better?

What particularly would you read if you could read better?

What was the best thing you ever read?

Do you like for someone else to read to you?

How do you feel when someone asks you to read out loud?

Do you enjoy talking about things you read?

Do you like it when someone else tells you about a book they read and liked?

How do you feel about school? What would you change?

What do you think you will need to be able to read in your future career?

Do you like to work on the computer? What kinds of things can you do?

Tell me about what you remember from elementary school reading classes.

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE - END OF SEMESTER

What does it take to be a good reader?

Do you think you are a good reader?

When you are reading and you come to something you don't know, what do you do?

What is the hardest thing about reading?

What was the best thing you ever read?

Do you like for someone else to read to you?

How do you feel when someone asks you to read out loud?

Do you enjoy talking about things you read?

Do you like it when someone else tells you about a book they read and liked?

How do you feel about school? What would you change?

What new things about reading have you learned this semester?

How do you feel about the reading sessions we have had?

What helped you the most?

What would you change about the sessions?

Do you think you are getting to be a better reader? Why do you think that?

What else would you like to say?

APPENDIX C
PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE

PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Please answer each question as thoroughly as possible. Return questionnaire to school as soon as possible. Thank you!

1. Have you noticed any changes in xxx's attitude toward reading, toward school, or ability to read over this semester?

2. What can you remember about xxx's experiences with reading as a young child (before she started school)?

3. What can you remember about xxx's experiences with reading in 1st, 2nd and 3rd grade?

4. What can you remember about xxx's experiences with reading after 3rd grade?

5. What do you picture in the future for xxx regarding education and career?

APPENDIX D
TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

May 5, 1999

Dear teachers,

I am currently conducting a case study of xxx for my doctoral work at UNT. Please fill out the attached questionnaire as thoroughly as possible. Your answers will be strictly confidential. No one will see your answers except me. A compilation of answers will be included as data in my study, however your name will never be used. Your answers will be only described as from "Teacher A", "Teacher B", etc. Pseudonyms will be used for xxx and for the school district, so your answers will in no way be connected to you.

Please complete the questionnaire and return it to my box by May 12. Thank you for your help!

Mary Arthur

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What do you think is the hardest reading your students have to do in your class?
2. What types of reading do your students have to do?
3. What do you do when a student reads below grade level?
4. What is your impression of xxx's reading ability?
5. Have you noticed any changes in xxx over the second semester regarding attitude toward reading in class, or ability to read class materials?
6. What else you would like to say?

APPENDIX E
SAMPLES OF RUNNING RECORD

*The How and Why of Fingerprints*Juanita
Posttest

A young woman wandered into the police station in a small town in Maine. She told police that she did not know who she was or where she had come from. The woman was suffering from amnesia, a loss of memory.

The chief of police took a ^{sample} set of the woman's fingerprints. The prints were sent to the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) fingerprint file in Washington, D.C., where they were matched with a set taken when the woman applied for a job with the government twenty years ^{ago/c} earlier. The woman's family was called, and they came to take her home.

Fingerprints are a sure, no-fail way of finding out who someone is. You can change your name, move to another country, get a new job, change your hairstyle, or put on or take off weight, but there is no way to change your fingerprints.

In earlier times, other means were used to make sure of someone's identity. For example, people might be ^{branded/c} branded for life to show that they had once committed crimes. In ancient Rome, soldiers who deserted the army were marked with a tattoo when they were found.

In later times, law officers ^{dep-/c} depended on their memory or used photographs to identify criminals. ^{file} But memories fail, and people's looks change.

Around 1870, a French scientist named Alphonse Bertillon found a way to measure and record the sizes of certain bones in the body. This method of identification was used for about thirty years. Then, around the beginning of the twentieth century, two men were found to have the same Bertillon ^(dup) measurements! This proved that the system was not foolproof.

During the early 1900's, police began to accept fingerprints as the best method of identification. Police departments set up their own files of fingerprints. In 1924, the FBI formed a national fingerprint file, which now holds copies of the fingerprints of 200 million people. The fingerprints on file are not only of people who have been involved in crimes. For example, men and women applying for the armed services and for certain jobs are asked for their fingerprints. That is how the police in Maine were able to identify the woman with amnesia.

Adapted from "The What and Why of Fingerprints," by Melvin Berger in Matters of Fact. Boston: HM 1981.

6 errors = 98% accuracy
1161 error rate
364 words
418
85 WPM

The How and Why of Fingerprints

Ben-Posttest

A young woman wandered into the police station in a small town in Maine. She told police ^{+ her} that she did not know who she was or where she had come from. The woman was suffering from amnesia, a loss of memory.

The chief of police took a set of the woman's fingerprints. The prints were sent to the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) fingerprint file in Washington, D.C., where they were matched ^{within 15} with a set taken when the woman applied for a job with the government twenty years earlier. The woman's family was called, and they came to take her home.

Fingerprints are a sure, no-fail way of finding out who someone is. You can change your name, move to another country, get a new job, change your hairstyle, or put on or take off weight, but there is no way to change your fingerprints. ^{take on or off} - What if you cut them off? or what if you realigned them with a knife?

In earlier times, other means were used ^{to find} to make sure of someone's identity. For example, people might be branded for life to show that they had once committed crimes. In ancient Rome, soldiers who deserted the army were marked with a tattoo when they were found.

In later times, law officers depended on their memory or used photographs to identify criminals. ^{file/c} But memories fail, and people's looks change.

Around 1870, a French scientist named Alphonse Bertillon found a way to measure and record the sizes of certain bones in the ^{or} body. This method of identification was used for about thirty years. Then, around the beginning of the twentieth century, two men were found to have the same Bertillon measurements! This proved that the system was not foolproof.

^{Bertillon} During the early 1900's, police began to accept fingerprints as the best method of identification. Police departments set up their own files of fingerprints. In 1924, the FBI formed a national fingerprint file, which now holds copies of the fingerprints of 200 million people. The fingerprints on file ^{were} are not only of people who have been involved in crimes. For example, men and women applying for the armed services and for certain jobs are asked for their fingerprints.

That is how the police in Maine were able to identify the woman with amnesia.

8 errors = 98% accuracy 364 words 4:01 minutes
1:46 AR

Adapted from "The What and Why of Fingerprints," by Melvin Berger in Matters of Fact. Boston: HM 1981.

REFERENCES

- Adams, M. (1994). Modeling the connections between word recognition and reading. In R. Ruddell, M. Ruddell, & H. Singer (Eds.), Theoretical models and processes of reading (4th ed., pp. 838-863). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Allington, R. (1983). The reading instruction provided readers of differing reading abilities. Elementary School Journal, 83, 548-559.
- Allington, R. (1994). The schools we have. The schools we need. The Reading Teacher, 48 (1), 14-28.
- Alm, R. (1981). The educational causes of reading difficulties. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 14 (4), 41-49.
- Anderson V. (1991, April). Training teachers to foster active reading strategies in reading disabled adolescents. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.
- Anderson, V. (1994). Intelligent people and learning difficulties. Journal of Reading, 38 (2), 136-137.
- Ballash, K. (1994). Remedial high school readers can recover, too! Journal of Reading, 37, 686-687.
- Barr, R., Blachowicz, C., & Wogman-Sadow, M. (1995). Reading diagnosis for teachers (3rd ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman Publishers.
- Base, G. (1987). Animalia. New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc.
- Bereiter, C., & Bird, M. (1985). Use of thinking aloud in identification and teaching of reading comprehension strategies. Cognition and Instruction, 2 (2), 131-156.
- Campbell, J., & Howard, V. (1993). Characteristics and strategies for the instruction of secondary students with learning disabilities in reading. B.C. Journal of Special Education, 17 (2), 183-192.
- Clay, M. (1991). Becoming literate: The construction of inner control. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Clay, M. (1993). Reading recovery: A guidebook for teachers in training. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Cohen, P., Kulik, J., & Kulik, C. (1982). Educational outcomes of tutoring: A meta-analysis of findings. American Educational Research Journal, 19, 237-248.

Covington, M. (1992). Making the grade: A self-worth perspective on motivation and school reform. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Crawley, S. & Marritt, K. (1996). Remediating reading difficulties (2nd ed.) Madison, WI: Brown & Benchmark.

Crowder, K. (1998, December). Developing relationships: changing patterns of interaction between student partners and delayed primary readers in a reading apprenticeship. Paper presented at the National Reading Conference, Austin, TX.

Dorn, L., French, C., & Jones, T. (1998). Apprenticeship in literacy: transitions across reading and writing. York, ME: Stenhouse Publishers.

Drum, P. & Madison, J. (1985). Vocabulary instruction: A conversational format. In J.A. Niles & R.V. Lalik (Eds.) Issues in literacy: A research perspective (34th yearbook of the National Reading Conference, pp. 59-64). Rochester, NY: National Reading Conference.

Gall, M., Borg, W, & Gall, J. (1996). Educational research. White Plains, N.Y: Longman.

Gaustad, J. (1992). Tutoring for at-risk students. OSSC Bulletin, 36, (3),1-72.

Gee, J. (1996). Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses (second ed.). London: Taylor & Francis Ltd.

Goodman, K. (1994). Reading, writing, and written texts: A transactional sociopsycholinguistic view. In R. Ruddell, M. Ruddell, & H. Singer (Eds.), Theoretical models and processes of reading (4th ed., pp. 1093- 1130). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Hiebert, E. & Calfee, R. (1992). Assessing literacy: From standardized tests to portfolios and performances. In S.J. Samuels & A.E. Farstrup (Eds.), What research has to say about reading instruction. (pp. 70 - 100). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Hock, M., Schumaker, J., & Deshler, D. (1995). Training strategic tutors to enhance learner independence. Journal of Developmental Education, 19 (1), 18-26.

Juel, C. (1996). What makes literacy tutoring effective? Reading Research Quarterly, 31 (3), 268-289.

Kennedy, M., Birman, B. & Demaline, R. (1986). The effectiveness of chapter 1 services. Washington, D.C., Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education.

Klass, D. (1996). Danger zone. New York: Scholastic.

Knapp, N. (1998, December). The reading apprenticeship intervention and its effects on reading skills and attitudes of delayed primary readers. Paper presented at the National Reading Conference, Austin, TX.

Knapp, N. & Winsor, A. (1998). A reading apprenticeship for delayed primary readers. Reading Research and Instruction, 38 (1), 13-29.

Kos, R. (1991). Persistence of reading disabilities: The voices of four middle school students. American Educational Research Journal, 28 (4), 875-895.

Lave, J. (1996). Teaching, as learning, in practice. Mind, Culture, and Activity, 3 (3), 149-164.

Lave, J. and Wenger, E. (1991). Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lee, N. and Neal, J. (1992-93). Reading rescue: Intervention for a student "at promise". Journal of Reading, 36 (4), 276-282.

Madden, N., Slavin, R., Wasik, B., & Dolan, L. (1997). Reading, writing, and language arts in success for all. In S. Stahl & D. Hayes (Eds.), Instructional models in reading. (pp. 109 - 130). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Matthews, S. (1993). Helping college tutors define reading and mold active learners. Journal of Reading, 36 (8), 636-641.

Mathewson, G. (1994). Model of attitude influence upon reading and learning to read. In R. Ruddell, M. Ruddell, & H. Singer (Eds.), Theoretical models and processes of reading (4th ed., pp. 1131-1161). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Merriam, S. (1988). Case study research in education: a qualitative approach. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Meyer, B., Brandt, D. & Bluth, G. (1978, March). Use of author's schema: Key

to ninth graders' comprehension. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, Ont., Canada.

Moniuszko, L. (1992). Motivation: Reaching reluctant readers age 14-17. Journal of Reading, 36 (1), 32-34.

Morawski, C. (1992). The "Reading and Writing Family Constellation Disclosure": Applications in holistic assessment and remediation. Reading Improvement, 29 (2), 82-93.

Morris, D., Shaw, B., & Perney, J. (1990). Helping low readers in grades 2 and 3: An after-school volunteer tutoring program. The Elementary School Journal, 91 (2), 133-150.

Oakes, J. (1985). Keeping track: How schools structure inequality. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Palincsar, A. (1986). The role of dialogue in providing scaffolded instruction. Educational Psychologist, 21(1 & 2), 73-98.

Paris, S., Lipson, M., & Wixson, K. (1994) Becoming a strategic reader. In R. Ruddell, M. Ruddell, & H. Singer (Eds.), Theoretical models and processes of reading (4th ed., pp. 788-810). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Paulsen, G. (1999). Danger on midnight river. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Paulsen, G. (1993). Nightjohn. New York: Delacorte Press.

Pearson, P. & Camperell, K. (1994). Comprehension of text structures. In R. Ruddell, M. Ruddell, & H. Singer (Eds.), Theoretical models and processes of reading (4th ed., pp. 448-468). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Phillips, D. & Soltis, J. (1998). Perspectives on learning. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Phillips, J. (1990, December). Creating a disabled reader: A father's perspective. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Reading Conference, Miami, FL.

Pinnell, G. (1989). Reading Recovery: Helping At-Risk Children Learn to Read. The Elementary School Journal, 90,161-183.

Reynolds, D. (1993). The Reading Recovery Program as it Relates to Understanding. Reading Improvement, 30, 76-81.

Rogoff, B. (1990). Apprenticeship in thinking: Cognitive development in social context. New York: Oxford University Press.

Rose, M. (1989). Lives on the Boundary. New York, NY229: Penguin.

Rosenblatt, L. (1978). The reader, the text, the poem: The transactional theory of the literary work. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Rosenblatt, L. (1994). The transactional theory of reading and writing. In R. Ruddell, M. Ruddell, & H. Singer (Eds.), Theoretical models and processes of reading (4th ed., pp. 1057-1092). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Rosenshine, B. & Meister, C. (1997). Cognitive strategy instruction in reading. In S. Stahl & D. Hayes (Eds.), Instructional models in reading. (pp. 85 - 107). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ruddell, R. & Unrau, N. (1994). Reading and a meaning-construction process: the reader, the text, and the teacher. In R. Ruddell, M. Ruddell, & H. Singer (Eds.), Theoretical models and processes of reading (4th ed., pp. 996-1056). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Scruggs, T. & Mastropieri, M. (1992). Teaching test-taking skills: Helping students show what they know. Cambridge: Brookline Books.

Simon, S. (1999). Storms. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Smith, F. (1994). Understanding reading. (5th ed.). New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Stahl, S. (1997). Instructional models in reading: An introduction. In S. Stahl & D. Hayes (Eds.), Instructional models in reading. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Stanovich, K.E. (1986). Matthew effects in reading: Some consequences of individual differences in the acquisition of literacy. Reading Research Quarterly, 21, 360-407.

Strecker, S. (1999, March). Toward understanding oral reading fluency. Paper presented at Texas State Reading Association, Houston, TX.

Swearingen, R. & Allen, D. (1997). Classroom assessment of reading processes. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Tierney, R. & Pearson, P. (1994). Learning to learn from text: A framework for improving classroom practice. In R. Ruddell, M. Ruddell, & H. Singer (Eds.),

Theoretical models and processes of reading (4th ed., pp. 496-519). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Unrau, N. (1998). Introduction to Vacca, R. (1998). Let's not marginalize adolescent literacy. Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy. 41 (8), 604.

Vacca, R. (1998). Let's not marginalize adolescent literacy. Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy. 41 (8), 604-609.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wasik, B. and Slavin, R. (1993). Preventing early reading failure with one-to-one tutoring: A review of five programs. Reading Research Quarterly , 28 (2), 179-200.

Weide, B. & Tucker, P. (1999). There's a wolf in the classroom. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Wertsch, J. (1985). Vygotsky and the social formation of mind. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wertsch, J. (1991). Voices of the mind: A sociocultural approach to mediated action. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wigfield, A., & Asher, S. (1984). Social and motivational influences on reading. In P.D. Pearson, R. Barr, M. Kamil, & P. Mosenthal (Eds.), Handbook of reading research (pp. 423-452). White Plains, NY: Longman.

Wilcox, C. (1999) Mummies. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Winsor, A. & Hettinger, H. (1998, December). Parents as "more knowledgeable others": Parents' perceptions and responses to participating in a reading apprenticeship with their children. Paper presented at the National Reading Conference, Austin, TX.

Wong, S., Groth, L., & O'Flahavan, J. (1994). Characterizing teacher-student interaction in reading recovery lessons. Reading Research Report No. 17. National Reading Research Center, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education.